

[1st November 1935]

IV.—MOTION *RE* SECOND REPORT OF THE MADRAS DELIMITATION COMMITTEE—*cont.*

Discussion of the motion *re* Second Report of the Madras Delimitation Committee was resumed.

11-30
a.m.

* Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—“ Mr. President, as many hon. Members are anxiously awaiting their turn, I will not take much of the Council's time. There are one or two very important points to which I failed to refer yesterday. When speaking yesterday with regard to the desirability of having a multi-member constituency I failed to draw the attention of the Council to one important aspect which to me is conclusive in favour of a multi-member constituency. The time is not far distant, Sir, when the population in this Presidency as well as throughout India, Muhammadans, Christians as well as Hindus all will come under a joint electorate. Even if the Muhammadans and the Christians are willing to come under the joint electorate the time may be distant when they may feel absolutely confident to dispense with the reservation of seats altogether. So if, in future, they have to come under joint electorates with the reservation of seats, you are now creating difficulties for the future by the small single-member constituencies by which vested interests will be created. If we are having bigger constituencies such considerations won't apply and it will be easy for the future. That is an aspect which the Delimitation Committee has entirely forgotten. There is another aspect which has not been properly considered by the Delimitation Committee. In apportioning seats to the various divisions in a district, there is bound to be a natural feeling of unfairness when a particular division containing, say, 300,000 population gets one seat and another division with almost the same population gets two seats. I think it is a legitimate complaint if one division gets one seat and the other under the same or similar conditions gets two. I shall just illustrate what I mean. This has come to happen mainly on account of the seats reserved for the scheduled community. After all the seat of a scheduled community is as good a general seat as any other seat. So far as the claims or rights of the voters are concerned, if a particular division has two seats it certainly has a better and more adequate representation for that division than another division having the same population but having only one seat. I hope the Government will look into it and make proper recommendation. Just to illustrate, I will take one or two instances. If you take West Godavari district, Ellore and Kovvur divisions, with about 350,000 population, has an additional scheduled seat, whereas Narasapur division having more population has only one seat. No doubt the scheduled population may be a little bit more in Ellore and Kovvur and that may be a reason for assigning the scheduled community seat. What I want to bring to the notice of the Council is whatever the scheduled population might have been, the general electorate including the scheduled castes at Ellore and Kovvur have got two seats as against one for Bhimavaram and Narasapur though the population is the same. The whole arrangement is bad and is to be altered. Take Nellore district, with regard to Kavali,

1st November 1935] [Mr. K. Koti Reddi]

Kandukur and Gudur, it is the same. Gudur has two seats. Kandukur with more population has one seat. That iniquity, I hope, will be set right. There is one other thing which I just want to mention. The postal system of voting has been recommended with regard to certain constituencies. The arrangement may be very convenient but the postal method leads to all sorts of undue influence and irregularities. I know, Sir, in certain instances the papers are actually removed from the voter by the candidates. You might say that after all the voter to whom the system of voting is entrusted is generally literate and he ought to safeguard his interest but in actual practice I know postal voting leads to all sorts of influences which can be avoided only by avoiding the postal system of voting. With regard to the Muhammadan seats in the Ceded districts I want to make one suggestion. If the Muhammadan seat assigned to the headquarters municipalities is assigned to all the municipalities in the Ceded districts the voting strength will be almost the same as in the rural constituencies. That will set right the inequality in the urban and rural voting. I do not see why the urban candidate should have such a great advantage as against the rural candidate. It is much easier because the voters are concentrated. The same thing applies to urban areas in the Hindu general constituency also. Finally I appeal once more to the Council and the Government for recommending increased representation for the Ceded districts. The Committee have considered it desirable on account of the special considerations of the Ceded districts to give more seats than they otherwise deserve according to the population basis. The Ceded districts have not the ghost of a chance to get any one of those seats to which I referred, viz., labour, mining, landholders, etc. They have not taken that aspect into consideration. If that is taken into consideration we ought to get more seats. Even strictly on the population basis the Ceded districts ought to get 20 seats and we have not been given more than that. So once more I appeal to the authorities to give one more seat to each of the Ceded districts, at any rate Kurnool having only two general seats should have one more. The Ceded districts are very poor and are sparsely populated though large in area, and if representation in the Upper Chamber, i.e., Legislative Council, is on the population basis or even voters basis, our share will be very little, though the Committee has recommended one seat to each district. This aspect will have to be taken into consideration in assigning seats to Assembly, because when there is difference of opinion between the two chambers on legislation, there is to be a joint session. I therefore plead that more representation ought to be given to the Ceded districts. With these words I move my amendment, Sir."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The amendment falls through for want of a seconder."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHoudari:—"Mr. President, Sir, already my friend has taken a sufficiently long time in speaking on the general points. Though my amendments are many, I assure the House that I will take only 15 minutes. I do not propose to read my amendments seriatim because they have already been circulated and I do not like to waste the time of the House now. I will take the items one by one and speak on the points covered therein. The first item is that there

[Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari] [1st November 1935]

should be plural-member constituencies and not single-member constituencies as proposed. The reason is that we must have political units. As I do not want to repeat arguments, I shall only refer to a few points which Government have not touched. I propose that every district should be a unit for the Legislative Assembly seats. Already we are having for the Legislative Council at present districts as units and there is some meaning in having a district or a district board as the unit. When once a person stands for the Legislative Council, the people of the constituency must know what the political career of the person is. As president or members of the district boards our activities must have been known to the people of the constituencies beforehand. As a matter of fact, Sir, most of the members of the Legislative Council are presidents of the district boards. They must therefore have the district board areas as political units. With that idea I proposed it as the political unit and not the geographical unit. Government now thought fit to have the district board area as a unit. Wherever the Government find that a district is unwieldy they are bifurcating the district. If at least the district board areas are formed into constituencies, it will be very reasonable and members can show their political activities in each such area and it will be good. Another thing is that if we have single-member constituencies, the several communities will not have adequate representation. Even though the constituency is a bit large, it will facilitate co-ordination of work. Two or three can unite and work and concentrate in those areas and thereby the difficulty of unwieldiness will not come in. Another thing, Sir, is this. When people are already accustomed to have plural-member constituencies, all on a sudden it is not desirable to bring a new change unless the change is for the good and unless the Government are dissatisfied with the system for sufficient reasons. There is no reason why we should change the system. Government always say, 'We are accustomed to certain things and we must respect custom in various matters.' I do not know why in this particular matter Government have not taken this view of customary habits and have changed it when it is working satisfactorily. If there are any manifest disadvantages we must try to remedy them. But no disadvantage has been mentioned either in the Government memorandum or in the speech of the Hon. the Finance Member or in the discussions of the Delimitation Committee.

"As regards the urban constituency of a district, it should consist of all the municipalities in the district. My reason is this. My district (Guntur) is given one seat for the urban area, that is, for the municipalities of Guntur and Tenali. The other three municipalities in the district are left out. Already the rural population of the Guntur district are affected by being given a single seat on the population basis. It is not difficult for a member to go and canvass in all the municipalities as they are so close to each other. If you look into the Delimitation Committee Report you will find that all the municipalities are quite close to one another.

"Another point is that no municipality should be included in any rural constituency. There are several disadvantages in doing so. As for municipal voters, they are living within a distance of a few miles

1st November 1935] [Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari]

and have good facilities for polling. In the villages people have to go some distance to reach the polling booths. Besides, villagers are not accustomed to record their votes properly, and the percentage of voting is very much less in a rural area than in a municipal area. This suggestion of mine is also found in the original Government memorandum.

"As regards the third part of my amendment, the Hon. Member in charge of this subject has stated that the population basis is the basis that has been taken. So I do not want to discuss it. I had already pointed out to Mr. Boag, the Secretary to the Committee, that the voting basis was not good and though I had no favourable answer from him, I am glad that the Government has now accepted the idea of population basis.

"Then my next point is that Guntur should be given a larger number of general seats on the basis of population. We have got a population of 20 lakhs and according to Appendix VIII of the memorandum we are entitled to get 8:9 seats. Unfortunately we are given only 8 seats. (Interruption.) Whether Guntur deserves more or the Ceded districts it is for the Central Committee to decide and not for you or me. Anyhow everybody has got to make representations as regards his own district. We are entitled to get one more seat. Under general seats we are entitled to 6:4, but we are only given 6, in the same Appendix. Under Muhammadan seats, we are entitled to 1:4, but we are given only 1. If all the fractions are counted, my request for one more seat will not be unreasonable. I request the Government to consider my proposal. I am not asking them to show any undue favour to my district.

"My next point is that Madras should get only three general seats with an additional seat for the scheduled classes. When all the districts are given seats on the population basis I do not see why there should be a departure from that principle in favour of Madras. They may say that Madras was already having four seats and want to retain them. But I ask why the same thing has not been observed in the case of Cocanada. Cocanada and Rajahmundry are put together and they are given one seat. Cocanada alone had one seat for the urban area. The women's seat should not be taken into consideration.

"My next point is that for Muhammadans in the Guntur district there should be two seats. Guntur district has got the largest Muhammadan population next only to Malabar. (Dr. P. Subbarayan: 'No.') Vizagapatam and Ganjam with a population of 54,000 were given one seat; West Godavari and Kistna with a population of 89,000 were given one seat; Trichinopoly with a population of 72,000 was given one seat; Madras with a population of 70,000 was given one seat; Kottayam and Wynad with a population of 79,000 were given one seat; Mangalore and South Kanara with a population of 73,000 were given one seat; whereas Guntur with a population of 150,000 was also given one seat. So I propose that two seats should be given for Muhammadans for Guntur, for the following considerations. The Muhammadan population for Guntur and Tenali taluks is 81,396, for Narasaraopet and Chirala, 76,350. These two Revenue divisions alone ought to have two

[Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari] [1st November 1935]

separate seats. These figures are correct and the Hon. Member can verify them. That is why we are anxious that we should be given one more seat.

"So far as the women's seat for the Indian Christians in the Guntur district is concerned, Guntur district has the largest Christian population in this Presidency, but unfortunately in the first Delimitation Committee report it was tacked on to Nellore; Tinnevely was given one seat though the population is much less than Guntur. Though I am not a Christian, I have presented a memorandum to the Delimitation Committee on this point. The Government of Madras had agreed with me in their first report, but later on they have given two seats to Tinnevely. They must come forward with their justification for this."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"May I point out to the hon. Member that he has completed the 15 minutes, the time-limit, set upon him by himself?"

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"Unfortunately there are so many points on which I have to speak, but I have not taken as much time as was taken by Mr. Koti Reddi."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am only reminding him of the time-limit that he has set upon himself."

Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI:—"I will come to a close, Sir. I have got only three more points."

"That is why, Sir, I feel that Guntur should get more representation for the Christian community and Government might recommend this to the Hammond Committee."

"Then about the women's seats, I am in favour of rotation. There is no object in fixing a seat for a particular district; thereby we are not encouraging women to come forward as in Madras. If Tinnevely is given one Christian seat now, let another chance be given to Guntur and the next chance to some other district. Similarly the general constituency ladies' seat must be in rotation, at least in respect of some important places, instead of giving it to Madras alone. Otherwise it would not give an impetus to women in the rural parts. The women of Madras are educated and take part in various political activities. If women in rural areas are given a seat, they will also come forward. I appeal to the Government to consider this point also."

"About the Commerce seat, the Government in their first report combined the three chambers into one electorate but somehow the Delimitation Committee has not thought fit to accept this proposal, and has given one seat to Nagarathars' Association and one for the Madras Chamber of Commerce. Most of the Nagarathars are representatives of the Madras Chamber of Commerce and as such I do not see why there should be a duplication of power for the Nagarathars alone. So I naturally feel that the Andhra Chamber of Commerce also must be given separate representation. If these three Chambers are not to be combined then as an alternative any merchant who pays an income-tax of Rs. 5,000 throughout the Presidency may be given a seat. What is being done now for the Legislative Assembly may be done for the local Legislative Assembly also."

1st November 1935] [Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari]

“ With regard to the system of voting, I personally feel that the distributive system is the best, although as the Government themselves have stated in their memorandum my community will not be affected by the proposed change. I feel that the distributive system of voting is preferable because the people are already accustomed to it and also because it has not proved a failure. In the circumstances I do not know why the Government want to change it. If any new system is now to be introduced in voting, the people will have to be educated on it. If the existing system is to be continued there will be no need to educate the public on the new system. For the change they are suggesting the Government must have very strong reasons. I personally feel that the distributive system must be continued as that will enable two or three friends to work together. Now, if you are going to introduce the non-transferable voting system it will create more disunion among the candidates and that is not desirable. Another thing is that under the new system even for the filling up of the scheduled caste seats the candidates will not work together and there will be no unity among the caste Hindus and Depressed classes. They will be cut away more and more apart. This will frustrate the object of having a common electorate for the Hindus and the scheduled classes.

12
noon.

“ About the filling up of the labour seats, I am in favour of the alternative system suggested by the Delimitation Committee. Under that system franchise will be extended throughout the districts and Guntur will have representation. Guntur has got a large labour population. The tobacco company there employs something like 3,000 labourers and if the proposal at pages 7 and 10 of the Report is adopted Guntur will get representation.

“ With these observations I move the amendment standing in my name, viz.—

‘ Add the following at the end:—

“ and on such consideration, this Council is of opinion—

- (1) that, in the formation of general constituencies, the principle of dividing the districts should be so followed as to bring about plural-member constituencies even in cases where there are no reserved seats, and that no territorial constituency should consist of less than two revenue divisions;
- (2) that where seats are allotted to an urban constituency of a district, the urban constituency should consist of all the municipalities in the district and that no municipality should be included in any rural constituency;
- (3) that, in allotting seats, whether in territorial constituencies or for communities, the basis of constituting the electorate should be the strength of the population and not the strength of the number of voters in the register of voters;
- (4) that, if the population basis is adopted, Guntur is entitled to a larger number of general seats than have been allotted to it;

[Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari] [1st November 1935]

- (5) *that for the City of Madras there should be only three general seats, with an additional seat for the scheduled classes;*
- (6) *that for the Muhammadans in the district of Guntur, there should be two seats;*
- (7) *that there should be a woman's seat for the Indian Christians in the Guntur district;*
- (8) *that women's seats should be allocated to districts having a particular strength of population on a rotatory basis, e.g., if, in respect of Indian Christians, Tinnevely is given a woman's seat in the first election, in the second election the seat should be allotted to Guntur and in the third election to the next district which has got a similar or approximately similar strength of population and similarly for other women's seats; and*
- (9) *that representatives of Indian Commerce should be elected by the combined electorate consisting of all the members of all Indian Chambers of Commerce and Indian Trade Associations recognized by the Government, or in the alternative by merchants paying an income-tax of Rs. 5,000 throughout the Presidency;*
- (10) *that the voting wherever there are more than one seat should be on the basis of distributive system;*
- (11) *that the proposals of the Government published in their Memorandum, dated 9th July 1935 in Appendix II regarding the allotment of seats for Labour are preferable to the proposals submitted by the Delimitation Committee in their Second Report*

or

that two seats may be allotted for Andhra districts for Labour instead of one as proposed by the Committee;

- (12) *that the scheme of distribution of seats for Labour given at page 7, paragraph 10 be approved in preference to the scheme given at page 8 of paragraph 10."*

* Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I formally second the amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Krishnayya Choudari. My say will be confined to other points not covered by the amendment.

"The report of the Madras Delimitation Committee embodies the results of the preparatory work done in connexion with the task that awaits the Indian Delimitation Committee in our province. How important are the functions to be discharged by the Indian Delimitation Committee may best be described in the words of Sir Laurie Hammond, the Chairman of the Committee. He is reported to have said in an interview:

'Our Committee is the first step taken to translate the much-discussed and keenly-contested theory into practice, to try to provide the essential part of the machinery to bring India's new constitution into actual operation.'

1st November 1935] [Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar]

“Therefore, the report under discussion merits very careful consideration. And before I come to grips with some of the recommendations in the report, I should like to pay a tribute to the memorandum of Mr. Boag. Though I am not in agreement with some of the suggestions contained therein, I am free to own that the memorandum is a very carefully considered document, has mentioned all facts, has set out the advantages and disadvantages of the various schemes and has also dealt with the difficulties and the ways to surmount them. Having said that I shall deal with the points that I wish to raise.

“A vital change has been made with reference to the Universities’ seat. That change, as I shall presently show, is against the intention of the Government of India Act of 1935, is against the implications of responsible government, is against the educated public opinion in the province, is against the recommendations of the Franchise Committee and is against the system that is obtaining in all English Universities and in other provinces in India. I may also submit that there are no valid and justifiable grounds for the change. I shall now take the points one by one.

“That the change is against the intention of the Government of India Act of 1935, I am sure that it will not be possible for any body to dispute the position that it is the intention of the Government of India Act that the franchise should be extended as widely as possible. That would be clear from what has been said in the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report. Paragraph 124 of the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report contains the following observations:—

‘The Statutory Commission were of opinion that the existing franchise was too limited and recommended that it should be extended so as to enfranchise about 10 per cent of the total population, and they laid a special emphasis upon the need for increasing the ratio of women to men voters. In 1932 between the Second and Third Sessions of the Round Table Conference, a Franchise Committee, which was presided over by one of our own members, was appointed by His Majesty’s Government for the purpose of examining the whole subject, with a view to an increase of the electorate to a figure not less than 10 per cent of the population suggested by the Statutory Commission nor more than 25 per cent.’

“Whereas in all other constituencies the policy has been to extend the franchise and not to restrict it, the proposal in respect of the universities seat takes away the existing franchise from thousands of graduates and transfers the right of election to a few hundreds. Here I would also like to point out that the distinguished representative of the Madras city in the Legislative Assembly raised this point in the Assembly and the Hon. Sir N. Sirkar, the Law Member, accepted the stand of the Hon. member Mr. Satyamurti.

“With reference to the position that the change is against the implications of responsible Government, I would like to refer to paragraph 15 of the Report of the Franchise Committee, where it has been said thus:—

‘In the second place, responsible Government implies that the main driving force behind legislation and public administration is public opinion, making itself effective through the electorate and the members returned to the legislatures by the electorate. It is therefore essential, as the Prime Minister stated, that under a system of responsible government the electorate should be

[Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar] [1st November 1935]

so widened that the legislature can reasonably be said to be representative of the general mass of the population. It is equally essential that no important section of the community should be deprived of the opportunity of making its needs and opinions felt in the legislatures, because under all democratic systems it is the interests of those who are represented which tend to receive consideration, while the interest of those who are not represented are liable to be ignored both at election time and afterwards."

"Sir, may I ask, are not the graduates who go to make up the educated classes of the Presidency an important section of the community?"

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, may I draw your kind attention to the fact that not a single member of the Government is present to listen to the debate? Also may I . . ."

The Hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—" (From seat No. 59) I am here."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The Hon. Minister is in the House."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Also so far nobody has spoken in defence of the Committee's Report so that we could have a good debate on the subject."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I did not hear the last sentence of the hon. Member."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I request you, Sir, to arrange that some defender of the Report should speak immediately after, so that we may meet the points raised in support of the report."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member might know that there is a large number of amendments on the agenda. All these have to be moved before we ask any of the defenders of the Report to come forward to make their observations." (Laughter.)

* Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—"May I ask, are not the graduates who go to make up the educated classes an important section of the community? The University is supposed to represent academic interest and educated classes, and the distinctive feature of the University is the educated electorate. The Senate contains ex officio and nominated members, members elected by district boards and municipalities and members elected by the Chambers of Commerce and other institutions of a similar type. What political outlook and political aspirations have the members of Senate as such?"

"Regarding the position that the change is against the educated opinion in the Presidency, I need but refer to the dissenting minute of Sir M. Ramachandra Rao and to paragraph 18 of the Second Report of the Delimitation Committee. Sir M. Ramachandra Rao says—

"The franchise now enjoyed by graduates in other universities of India has been preserved by the Delimitation Committees in other Provinces, while in this province the invidious treatment accorded to the graduates by my colleagues will cause considerable bitterness."

"And the report of the Delimitation Committee has pointed out that 'a number of representations have been received protesting against this proposal, and asking that the electorate should consist of the general body of graduates of the three universities.'

1st November 1935] [Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar]

“That the change is against the recommendation of the Franchise Committee will be clear from paragraph 335 of their report where it is said as follows:—

‘We are not unanimous as to the composition of the electorate for the University seats. The majority of us consider, however, that the balance of advantage rests with election by the registered graduates and not by the Senate or the court alone. One important argument in favour of this view being the fact that in many cases the Senate is largely formed by nomination.’

“The recommendations of the Franchise Committee deserve special attention because the Joint Parliamentary Committee has said—

‘We are greatly indebted to the admirable and exhaustive Report of the Franchise Committee, which reached its conclusions after prolonged and intensive discussions in India with the Provincial Governments and with Provincial Franchise Committees; and we are satisfied that their recommendations have met with general support from Indian opinion, expressed not only in India but also at the Third Session of the Round Table Conference, in the evidence of the witnesses who appeared before us, and in the discussions which we have had with the British-India delegates.’

“Moreover the Hon. Gentleman the Finance Member said yesterday that the Indian Delimitation Committee is but a continuation of the Indian Franchise Committee. The above recommendation was made by the Indian Franchise Committee in May 1932. Sir, what has happened since May 1932 to necessitate a change? Is it the return of the Congressmen in the Assembly elections? Is it the return of Congressmen at the by-elections? I cannot see any other reason for the change.

“That the change is against the system obtaining in all English Universities and in the other provinces in India will be clear from paragraph 18 of the Second Report of the Delimitation Committee, where it is said—

‘The Committee realizes that in all the English Universities’ constituencies any graduate can be enrolled as an elector on payment to the University of a fee of £1. The Committee is further aware that in other provinces in India it is proposed to form the Universities’ constituency of graduates of a certain number of years’ standing . . .’

“Here I would like to point out what has been done in Bombay. The Bombay Provincial Delimitation Committee says— 12-15 p.m.

‘Under the present Electoral Rules, Members of the Senate or Honorary Fellows of the University or Graduates of the University of 7 years’ standing are qualified to be electors for the Bombay University constituency. The majority of our committee (5 out of 9) are of opinion that in order to increase the electorate in the University constituency the graduates’ qualification should be altered to enable graduates of five years’ standing to be qualified as electors.’

“Sir, that is the position. Moreover can it for a moment be said that proper representatives were not elected by the graduates? Look at the names of the distinguished gentlemen elected. The first representative was Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar, a former Advocate-General of the Presidency and a gentleman who during his active

[Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar] [1st November 1935]

days had much to do with the Madras University. Then came Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi, a very distinguished Member of this House and a gentleman who was the Vice-Chancellor of the Andhra University. After that was Mr. Satyamurti, a prominent member of the present Legislative Assembly and a gentleman who is connected with the Senate and the Syndicate of the Madras and the Annamalai Universities. The present representative is Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar, a gentleman who was elected as President of the Madras Corporation and who was awarded by the Government the Kaiser-i-Hind Medal. What can possibly be said against these stalwarts except that three of them are Brahmans and Mr. C. R. Reddi is in some quarters thought to be as good or as bad as a Brahman. (Laughter.) Next I shall also examine the grounds urged in support of the change proposed.

“The first ground is this: that in Madras there are not many nominated members of the Senate and even they are not nominated by the Government but by the Chancellor. When in the interests of progress of democracy it has been found necessary to completely do away with nominations, this argument will not hold water. It is not at all a question of numbers. Regarding the point that nominations are made by the Chancellor and not by the Government. Who is the Chancellor? Is he not the Governor of Madras? Why make such nice distinctions and support a weak case?

“The second ground urged is as follows:—

‘Further the majority of the Committee feel that graduates as such have no special interests which justify their inclusion in the special electorate. There was perhaps some good reason to give them a vote in the University constituency so long literacy by itself did not qualify for a vote in a general constituency.’

“Here again I would like to refer to paragraph 20 of the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report where it has been said—

‘Parliamentary Government, as it is understood in the United Kingdom, works by inter-action of four essential factors; the principle of majority rule; the willingness of the minority for the time being to accept the decisions of the majority; the existence of great political parties divided by broad issues of policy rather than by sectional interests; and finally the existence of a mobile body of political opinion owing no permanent allegiance to any party and therefore able by its instinctive reaction against extravagant movements on one side or the other to keep the vessel on an even keel.’

“Sir, where do you get in a better measure this mobile body of political opinion except from a body composed of the graduates. The Committee urges that so long as literacy is a qualification the graduates will have their votes in the general constituency. That may be so, but that will not be the verdict of an educated electorate.

“The next point urged is—

‘Some members of the Committee feel strongly that the Senate being the body charged with the administration of the affairs of the University is the most appropriate body to elect a representative to the legislature and to give that representative a mandate.’

1st November 1935] [Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar]

"May I ask, Sir, whether the Senate as an administrative body has any special interest in politics or legislatures? If that be so, why not give representation to district boards too? Yet another argument is this—

'If the representative of the University is to be elected by the general body of graduates a number of individuals with no organization and no ties or bonds in common he cannot look to them for any mandate.'

"If this reasoning is sound, it is not clear how the combined electorate composed of members of the Senate, Syndicate, and Academic Council of even one University, let alone three distinct Universities, can give a mandate?

"There is one more ground to be considered and that is—

'The majority of the Committee, however, on the ground that the seat is provided for a representative of the "Universities" and that the "University" is defined in the Universities Acts as a body corporate consisting of the Chancellor, the Pro-Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor and the Members of the Senate, the Syndicate and the Academic Council, would prefer to modify their former recommendation and to recognize as the constituency all the members of the body corporate as defined in the University Acts.'

"The answer to this is furnished by Sir M. Ramachandra Rao in his minute of dissent where he says—

'The contention put forward by the majority of the Committee that the word "Universities" in the Government of India Act, 1935, should be construed by the definition of the word "University" in the Madras University Act of 1923 is altogether without any justification. A parliamentary enactment cannot be construed by a definition given in an Act of local legislature in India.'

"Thus it will be seen that so far as the Universities' constituency is concerned, not only are there no valid and justifiable grounds for a change, but everything points to the continuance of the present system.

"Sir, I shall next deal with the three possible ways of voting, viz., the distributive method, the cumulative method and the single non-transferable method. In view of what the majority of the Committee has said, my remarks will be confined to the single non-transferable system and to the distributive system. According to the distributive vote, the elector has as many votes as there are candidates, but can give only one vote for any one candidate. The single vote is a novel scheme, but is preferred on two grounds, viz., (1) it is simple and (2) that it is not opposed to the Poona Pact. Regarding the fact that it is a simple one, the distributive method of voting has been exercised in this province for the last 15 years. That method is being exercised in the local boards and all municipalities. That is also the method by which the European and Anglo-Indian seats are even now proposed to be filled up. In respect of the contention that the single vote does not offend against the Poona Pact, I would like to refer to the memorandum of Mr. Boag, where it says—

'If each voter has only one vote, it is probable that the scheduled castes can elect the person whom they really prefer out of the panel of four chosen at the primary election. In practice probably the caste ryots will

[Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar] [1st November 1935]

cast their vote for a caste candidate and the scheduled castes for a scheduled caste candidate though of course it would be open to a caste ryot to cast his vote for a scheduled caste candidate and *vice versa*.'

"The main aim of the Poona Pact is inter-dependence of communities. How can there be an inter-dependence of communities in the light of what has been said in the memorandum? I was surprised to hear the Hon. the Finance Member saying yesterday that he kept an open mind with reference to every thing except with regard to two matters, viz., (1) the single-member constituency and (2) the single non-transferable vote. Why should he not keep an open mind with regard to these points too unless it be that the Government wants to drive in the thin end of the wedge of the policy of 'divide and rule.'

"Then, Sir, I quite appreciate the statement of the Hon. Gentleman the Finance Member that it is not profitable to go into details connected with each district and that such an attempt is but 'Robbing Peter to pay Paul.' That being so, I would never have said anything regarding Malabar, had I felt sure that with reference to Malabar, the story of the Wolf and the Lamb has not been enacted. When seats were distributed to the Hindus it was said that on the population basis they are entitled to only seven or eight seats. But when it came to the question of distributing the seats to the Mappillas, that principle of population was given up. Why should that weapon be used against the Mussalmans of Malabar alone? I hope the matter will be carefully gone into.

12-30 P.M. "Sir, though I formally seconded the amendment now before the House, I am against it in so far as it relates to commercial representation, because I do feel strongly that a distinction ought to be made between general commercial interests and special commercial interests. The Indian Franchise Committee has rightly said that there should be present on the legislatures representatives who will speak from the expert and technical point of view. I am in entire agreement with the present system.

"Mr. President, I have done. I only wish to draw the attention of the House to the speech of His Majesty the King-Emperor in dissolving Parliament. Referring to India, His Majesty said—

'I trust that when the further steps required to bring the Act into operation have been taken, its provisions will not only bring in contentment and well-being to the people of India and Burma, but draw closer the bonds of amity between them and the rest of my Empire.'

"Every hon. Member should welcome that statement and strive for the result. But the result will not be achieved unless India is made safe for democracy. I therefore appeal to all hon. Members, in whatever section of the House they may sit and however profoundly they may differ in politics, not to do anything that would prevent the progress of democracy in our province."

1st November 1935]

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—“ Mr. President, Sir, the amendments standing in my name are Nos. (4) and (5). I will first move No. (4) which runs as follows :—

‘ Add the following at the end :—

“ and on such consideration this Council is of opinion that the system of voting for plural-member constituencies shall be on the basis of the distributive vote and not on the single non-transferable vote, as recommended in the Report.”

“ Sir, I do not think I need say much on this system of voting recommended in the report which has not received the approval of the general public nor of any enlightened section of the public. Therefore it would be but meet and just that the Government should revise their opinion about this system of voting and change their views in the light of the discussions in this Council. The case made out by Mr. Boag in his memorandum in favour of the single non-transferable vote is not convincing. The most important aspect which has appealed to the Provincial Delimitation Committee seems to be one of administrative difficulty. They are afraid that with the limited polling staff available it would be impossible to get through the polling in a single day. But I do not think that this is an insurmountable difficulty. Nor is it a difficulty which is of any real or practical consequence. The Government ought not to find it difficult to find the necessary polling staff and finish the elections in a single day. The Government in England have been doing it for many years and I do not think there will be any difficulty either on the ground that there will be plural-member constituencies in some parts of the Presidency. According to the fundamental principle of voting, if two members are to be returned by any particular constituency, you cannot say that of the two members A and B, A alone may represent one particular section and B may represent another section of the people. That is to say that the two candidates should represent two different sections. That is what it will amount to when the system of single non-transferable vote is adopted. But, on the other hand, the two representatives from a plural-member constituency must be taken to represent together the entire electorate in the whole constituency. And you cannot make both the members representative of the entire constituency by the method of the single non-transferable vote. It should be made possible for all the voters to exercise their franchise in favour of both the candidates for the two seats. It is not really rational to deprive the voter of his right to choose a candidate for each seat in his constituency. The system of non-transferable single vote would not work in this country. It is no use arguing that in this country there will be difficulties in working the present system of voting in an enlarged electorate. On the other hand there will be many difficulties in working the novel system proposed by the Government and the Delimitation Committee. The people in this country have become used to the distributive system of voting for a long time and it will be easy for them to mark their votes in favour of any number of candidates whom they want to choose. The second paragraph of Mr. Boag’s memorandum says that facilities will be given to the scheduled castes and

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [1st November 1935]

other minority communities to exercise their franchise in favour of persons whom they want to choose. But that is not quite intelligible when you find that the point of interdependence between one section of population and another is knocked out. For another reason also it is not advisable that the present right of the voters should be so restricted. I assert that even in the changed electorate distributive vote is perfectly possible and the voters have become already used to it. For instance there may be several candidates in a constituency—a Mudaliyar, a Nayudu and a Kamma. The voter may be at present accustomed to give one vote for the Mudaliyar, one vote for the Nayudu and one vote for the Kamma. It ought not to be impossible under the distributive system to choose persons from the various communities. If the intention of the Government is that the minorities within the Hindu community ought to be adequately represented, that can be achieved only by this system of distributive vote. It will be perfectly possible and rather more easy for the voter to give one vote for the caste-Hindu and one vote for the Adi-Dravida candidate or two votes for the caste-Hindu and two votes for the Adi-Dravida candidates under the distributive system. The voter has gained much experience and the present system has worked successfully. And I wonder why it is seriously suggested that all this education of the voter and all the experience gained by him in the past should be thrown to waste. I would therefore strongly urge that this Council should strongly insist on the adoption of the distributive system and not the single non-transferable vote.

“I come now to the second amendment which refers to the distribution of seats so far as the Muslim community is concerned. I move, Sir, the following:—

‘Add the following at the end:—

“and on such consideration, this Council is of the opinion that the distribution of Muslim seats in the Provincial Assembly and the Council should be on the following basis:—

Provincial Assembly.

- (1) That each district containing a Muslim population of 35,000 and above and a voting strength of 4,000 and above excluding the two West Coast districts shall be assigned one seat.
- (2) That districts containing a population of less than 35,000 and a voting strength of less than 4,000 shall be combined into single constituencies, if adjoining one another or tacked on to a neighbouring district which is a constituency under paragraph (1).
- (3) That the woman's seat shall be allotted to the city of Madras.
- (4) That there shall be one urban (men's) seat for the city of Madras, one urban seat for a group of selected municipalities in the Tamil districts, and a third urban seat for all the municipalities in Malabar.

1st November 1935] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

- (5) *That the remaining six seats shall be assigned to Malabar and South Kanara which shall be divided into convenient constituencies for the purpose.*
- (6) *That the actual result worked out on the basis of these principles shall be as follows:—*

Districts.	Rural.	Urban.
Ganjam, Vizagapatam and East Godavari ..	1	..
West Godavari and Kistna	1	..
Guntur	1	..
Nellore	1	..
Cuddapah	1	..
Kurnool	1	..
Bellary	1	..
Anantapur	1	..
Chittoor	1	..
Chingleput	1	..
Madras	..	1
Madras (Woman)	..	1
North Arcot	1	..
South Arcot	1	..
Tanjore	1	..
Trichinopoly	1	..
Ramnad	1	..
Madura	1	..
Tinnevely	1	..
Salem	1	..
Coimbatore and Nilgiris	1	..
Malabar and South Kanara	6	..
Malabar municipalities	..	1
Selected municipalities in Tamil districts	..	1

- (7) *That in the event of a single seat not being assigned to Chingleput district, the same shall be tacked on to Chittoor as originally proposed by Government in their Memorandum to the Delimitation Committee."*

"That is so far as the Provincial Assembly is concerned. As regards the Provincial Council, I move—

- (1) *that one seat shall be allotted to the districts of Malabar and South Kanara; and*
- (2) *that the remaining six seats shall be allotted to the remaining districts divided into six convenient constituencies, each constituency being assigned one seat.'*

"Sir, the recommendations of the Second Report of the Delimitation Committee are not really so very unsatisfactory as those in the first report. My purpose in moving this amendment is only to improve those recommendations to the extent to which it is desirable. In their first report, the Committee took population as the only and only basis for the distribution of seats, but I am glad that subsequently the majority of the Committee revised its opinion. I am, of course, conscious of the various minutes of dissent including the powerful minute of dissent by my hon. Friend, Mr. Raman Menon. All the same I am glad that the Second Report of the Committee has taken into consideration the fundamental principle which the Muslim community as a whole has

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [1st November 1935]

pressed for being taken into account. (Mr. T. M. Moidu Sahib: 'No.') I submit so far as the Muslim community is concerned, the population basis should not be the sole guiding principle in the allotment of seats. Just as there have been weighty considerations for the allotment of more seats to the Muslim community as a whole than they would be entitled to on a population basis, so also, there are considerations why the same principle of weightage should be followed in the distribution of the Muslim seats among the various parts of the Presidency. Those principles and considerations have been urged by me in the memoranda I submitted to the Delimitation Committee and I do not think any useful purpose will be served by my repeating those arguments. However, I am glad to note that the Committee has agreed with my view that so far as the Muslim community is concerned, population alone should not be the basis of the distribution of seats. In one or two respects, the recommendations of the Delimitation Committee have not come up quite to the expectations of the generality of the Muslim community. No doubt, the Muslim population of Malabar and South Kanara is very large, being over one-third of the total Muslim population in the Presidency. But that accidental factor alone should not be basis of the distribution of seats. For the basis on which the Lucknow Pact was entered into and the Communal Award was given by His Majesty's Government was that there should be adequate and effective representation for the Muslim minority. If the same principle of adequate representation is applied in the distribution of the seats allotted to the Muslim community in this Presidency, you cannot but give more seats to Muslims in areas where they are in a minority. It would not be fair to award over-representation to districts where the Muslim community is in a huge majority. The basis of representation should be that the interests of the Muslim community in a particular area should be represented in the Council and the Assembly. This representation can be given effectively by having one, two or even three members. You can have even half a dozen members for a district to make representations. For instance, let them have half a dozen members on the basis of population. I have no objection. But why deprive other districts where there is a considerable population, though not really as big as in Malabar, of adequate representation? It cannot be said that the district of Malabar can represent the Telugu districts or that the Tamil districts can represent the Telugu districts and vice versa. That is why I urge very strongly that there is no need, no necessity, nor is it in any way desirable to give Malabar representation in excess of the needs of the situation. Six seats are quite adequate and more than adequate to represent all the interests put together. Admittedly the interests are all homogeneous and the aspirations are all alike. There is no difference between area and area within Malabar. I have not come across any statement which would go to show that there is any difference between one area and another area in Malabar. Even if there were differences, the six seats could be allotted to six different constituencies, the different constituencies being formed to represent different interests.

1st November 1935] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

“ Again, Sir, in the case of the general seats, the Committee is of the opinion that the district should not be put down as a unit; but in the case of Muslims they have forgotten this principle; in the latter case, as I have said, two or three districts have been grouped for one constituency. In the past it might not have been possible to give one seat for each district on account of the small number of seats then available. Now when you have 28 men seats, it should be possible to allot one seat to each district and to give the balance to that district where the population is by far the largest. That is the equitable principle that I seek to urge. I am glad that only to a certain extent the Delimitation Committee has agreed with me. But does not give entire satisfaction. 12-45 P.m.

“ There are one or two respects in which the second report of the Delimitation Committee should be improved. Chingleput was originally and rightly, I think, according to Mr. Boag's memorandum, tacked on to Chittoor. The argument that was advanced, as I understand it, in the Committee seems to have been that there were some linguistic differences. From what I know and I believe the facts are not otherwise, the district of Chittoor is partly Tamil and partly Telugu; Chingleput district also consists of a predominantly Tamil element and a small Telugu element. There should therefore be no difficulty at all, no question of linguistic differences at all to combine Chingleput with Chittoor. Further the Committee have now given one seat to the district of Salem where the population is only just 56,000. But they have combined Chingleput and South Arcot where the population is 76,000 plus 37,500. That makes a total of a lakh and more. I submit that the population of South Arcot demands that it should be given a separate seat by itself; the district of Chingleput ought to be clubbed with the district of Chittoor. The argument that the two districts are not contiguous is not insurmountable. There should be no difficulty in forming the Chingleput district and the Chittoor district into one constituency.

“ With regard to the question of the urban versus rural seats, that is a matter upon which I have bestowed much thought and I think that there should not be any depriving of the rights which have been enjoyed by certain urban areas under the old dispensation. For the municipalities of Trichinopoly *cum* Srirangam and Madura, there has been one urban constituency and the Madras City another urban constituency. The proportion at that time was two out of thirteen. The proportion should have been increased now or at least maintained. On the contrary we find that the second report of the Committee has not increased the number of urban seats to any substantial extent, except by one. I submit, Sir, that those urban areas in the Tamil districts which have been enjoying the urban seats ought to be allowed to enjoy those seats, even though it may not possible to give them an extra urban seat. On the other hand, the Telugu districts where there was no urban seat at all, have now been assigned one urban seat. I was not aware of it until I saw the second report of the Delimitation Committee. At first there was no idea of assigning any more seat to

[Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed] [1st November 1935]

the areas in the Telugu districts much less any urban seat. I would therefore urge that the towns of Trichinopoly, Madura, Negapatam and Srirangam ought to be given one urban seat and should form one single urban constituency.

“ With regard to the distribution of seats to the Council, the Committee have assigned two seats to the West Coast. I say very respectfully that one seat ought to be sufficient for these two districts. There are only six seats then left for the whole Presidency with 25 districts. If two seats are to be given to Malabar, it will be a great injustice and the rest of the Presidency will not have adequate representation. I submit, Sir, that the mere question of population should not be the guiding principle in the distribution of seats. Other considerations which have been set forth in the Franchise Committee report of 1919 and in the letter addressed by His Majesty to the Hammond Committee ought to be taken into consideration in the distribution of these seats. We ought to provide for effective representation and secure direct and as far as possible intimate contact between the electors and the elected. That will not be possible if you are going to club six or five districts together, when it is quite possible to club three or four districts and assign one seat for each group. I would therefore say that the assignment of two seats to the West Coast and five seats to the rest of the Presidency requires revision; any revision in that direction will be only just, fair and equitable.

“ I am glad, Sir, that on the recommendation of the Women Sub-Committee one Muslim woman seat has already been assigned to the Madras City; the most desirable thing has been done; I have no quarrel with that. As regards the Muslim men seats, I would say that each district should be given one seat and the remaining seats should go to Malabar in view of the excess of population it has. That arrangement alone will give satisfaction and meet the requirements of the Muslim community at any rate in the Tamil districts.

“ One other point I would urge. In the constitution of the Muslim Sub-Committee by the Government, Muslim representation in the Council as it is at present constituted was not adequately reflected. There was also some default in the matter. It was attempted at a later stage to set right the default. But nothing very appreciable was done. The Muslim Members in the present Council who have been representing their constituencies for a number of years have also submitted a joint memorandum to the Delimitation Committee; it is incorporated in the papers that have been printed. Out of thirteen Muslim Members in this Hon. House, ten Members including Mr. Yahya Ali, who was a member of the Provincial Delimitation Committee, have agreed to a certain distribution. The Committee and the Government should have given due respect and due weight to the memorandum of ten members of this Council who are all so well acquainted with the needs and the aspirations of the constituencies which they have the honour to represent. I do not think that that distribution errs on the side of any

1st November 1935] [Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed]

excess or any injustice. I would therefore urge that it is but meet and reasonable that the representation of ten out of thirteen elected members of this House should be given due weight in the matter of the distribution of Muslim seats both in the Assembly and the Council. I therefore move the amendment which I have already read out."

* Khan Bahadur P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, I beg to second the amendment that has been moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed. I beg to place before the House my reasons for doing so. So far as the Provincial Assembly is concerned, he has given a list by which each district can be given a seat separately. He has already explained how it is just and necessary that such a distribution should be made so far as the Muslims in this Presidency are concerned. Of course in urging this suggestion, I am not unaware of the fact that it will look as if we are trying to deprive our Muslim friends of Malabar the seats to which they are entitled if the seats are to be given according to the population basis alone. I beg to remind my hon. Friends from Malabar that mere numbers ought not to count; if each district is represented, Muslim interests will be best served. I am sure my hon. friends from Malabar cannot say that giving a very large number of seats to Malabar will serve Muslim interests better. One corner of the Province will be represented and over-represented and not the entire Province as a whole. As such I would appeal to my Malabar friends not to oppose this motion because it is framed in the best interests of the community as a whole in the Province.

"Coming to the urban seats, my friend has already stated that Trichinopoly and Madura have been deprived of their urban seat. I am in this House to-day and for so many years past representing the urban area of the Trichinopoly and Madura districts. Absolutely no reason has been given why these districts have been deprived of their urban representation. There are as many as eight municipalities in these two districts and in most of these municipalities there is a very strong Muslim population. I am not quarrelling with the recommendation of the Committee in giving an urban seat to the Ceded districts. By all means if they deserve it, let them have it. What I am now urging before the House is that all the municipalities in the Madura and Trichinopoly districts do deserve an urban seat, which they have been enjoying under the present reforms. Their case is all the more strong because they are at present having that privilege and it is but just and proper that they should continue to have the same privilege even under the coming reforms also.

"With your permission, Sir, I wish to say a word or two about another matter, in the matter of election of a member representing the graduates. This case has already been argued from different aspects by the speakers who have dealt with the matter before me. I would also beg to urge upon the extreme reasonableness of getting representation directly through the graduates themselves and not

[P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur] [1st November 1935]

through the channel of the Senate, for the simple reason that whereas the seat in the Assembly is to represent the graduates, the members of the Senate are not all representatives of the graduates alone. For instance, in the composition of the Senate, not only the graduates are represented but also district boards and municipalities. The representatives of district boards and municipalities cannot in any sense be said to represent the graduates. As such the members of the Senate cannot truly represent the graduates in the Province. It is therefore but fair and reasonable that if the graduates should be represented on the Assembly properly, the election ought to be directly by the graduates and certainly not through the channel of the Senate as proposed."

The House then adjourned for lunch.

After Lunch (3 p.m.)

* Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—"Sir, I beg to move the amendment standing in my name, viz.:—

'Add the following at the end:

"and on such consideration this Council is of opinion that the Revenue division of Sankari in Salem district, comprising the taluks of Tiruchengodu and Omalur should form a single constituency having two general seats, as both the taluks are too unequal in population and voting strength and the reasons for such a course are not in any way behind those of the taluks of Chacacole and Paralakimedi for which the Committee has thought fit to give two general seats combining both the taluks".

I shall also move the other amendment standing in my name, viz.:—

'Add the following at the end:

"and on such consideration this Council is of opinion—

'(1) that multi-member constituencies or at least dual-member constituencies as set out in Appendix V of the Government Memorandum originally issued subject to such modifications as are necessary to meet the requirements of each case should be formed;

(2) that distributive system of voting should be adopted;

(3) that in the allotment of urban seats, groups of not more than two urban areas within a single district as recommended by Government in paragraph 6 of G.O. No. 355, Law (Legislative—Elections), dated 19th August 1935, be adopted as it is most equitable from all points of view;

1st November 1935] [Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder]

(4) *that the electorate for the University constituency should consist of all the graduates of the Universities of this province; and*

(5) *that proper and effective steps be taken to prepare a correct electoral list for each area with full particulars as to the father or guardian's name and the actual place of residence of each elector and to fix a polling station in each village or groups of villages having a voting strength of more than 400 '."*

Sir, I should like to say a few words on each of these items.

" With regard to the first amendment which relates to the grouping of the Tiruchengodu and Omalur taluks and giving them two seats, I may say that the Delimitation Committee during their first sittings decided that the Sankari revenue division should form a single constituency having two members. In the same way they decided that some twelve more constituencies should be formed like that. In their first report, in paragraph 3, they have definitely stated in unmistakable terms thus:—

' The majority of the Committee favour an arrangement by which there will be as many single-member constituencies as possible, subject to the condition that revenue divisions should not be broken up except in cases where it is absolutely necessary.'

" They laid down this principle that revenue divisions should not be broken up except where absolutely necessary, and presumably following this principle and the unequal strength of population and voting strength they thought it fit to treat the whole revenue division of Sankari as one constituency. But I was surprised to see in the Government Order issued on the first report a suggestion to the effect that the two taluks might be split up. From the way in which the wording of the Government Order in this particular case is put I am not convinced that the Government are really earnest in dividing these two taluks. It simply says:

' Similarly the Government consider that the taluks of Tiruchengodu and Omalur may each be formed into a single member constituency.'

" Mark the word ' may ' when in other cases the word ' should ' is used. In any way a suggestion has been thrown evidently without any tangible reason for dividing them, and the wording clearly shows that it has been made somewhat reluctantly. I am led to believe, Sir, that this change was made from a party point of view. I am compelled to make this statement, because as soon as the Committee issued their first report, the spokesmen belonging to the party in power had toured the districts and gauged their position in each area and they paid a visit to Omalur also. That makes me doubt whether under the influence of the party in power this change has been made.

[Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder] [1st November 1935]

“ Taking now the actual figures, the population and voting strength of the taluks of Chicacole and Parlakimedi are:—

	Taluks.	Population.	Voters.
Chicacole		2,90,557	33,885
Parlakimedi		194,802	23,746
	Difference ..	95,755	10,139
Tiruchengodu		345,166	39,496
Omalur		257,080	22,589
	Difference ..	88,086	16,907

“ The Delimitation Committee considered that difference in voting strength and population in the matter of splitting up of revenue divisions should weigh to keep them intact. And I submit, Sir, that the difference in voting strength in the Tiruchengode-Omalur area is comparatively much greater than in the Chicacole-Parlakimedi area. Although the difference in population is comparatively a little less, the difference in voters is much greater in this case. What I am most concerned with is this; if the Committee in the first instance, in an unbiassed view, thought it fit to allow the division to form one constituency, but later changed it, one is led to believe that it should have been done with some motive. I am compelled to think so, because the Committee itself has been formed in such a manner that the views of the party in power could only be carried. (The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. Bracken: ‘ No, Sir.’) This is a measure which is to come into force afterwards, and it must be the policy that all parties should get equal chances; but here, from the composition of the Committee itself. . . . ”

Mr. G. T. BOAG:—“ On a point of order, Sir. If I may be allowed to do so, I may point out that it was the present Government and not the Committee that divided this Sankari division into two separate constituencies.”

* Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—“ But the Committee subsequently altered its opinion. That makes me deal with the question so elaborately. The Committee has been composed of such members of the party in power or of those who are inclined to that view, that it was easy for the Committee to change its mind subsequently after it came to know their real position in that area. Anyhow, I leave it at that. I have given the figures, and I leave it to the Central Delimitation Committee to take them into consideration and come to a decision on this matter.

“ Now with regard to the other points on which I have given notice of amendments, the first one is the question of multi-member constituencies. From the facts furnished to us in an elaborate way in his memorandum by Mr. Boag, and from the arguments advanced therein in regard to both single-member and plural-member constituencies, one

1st November 1935] [Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder]

is led to conclude that in the present conditions of our province, the system of multi-member constituencies is the most suited. If single-member constituencies are formed and if a taluk or revenue division is treated as a constituency, we will not be able to get the best people in the districts into the legislatures. That is what I fear. If a single taluk is to be a constituency, the prominent man in the area, who may not in some cases be desirable, may have better chances than others who will have greater support if the area were much bigger, and who may be much better fitted to be in our legislatures. Further by restricting the areas to such a small unit, the election is likely to be influenced by money. So, if the Government and the Committee are not agreeable to treat one district as a unit, I would like that at least dual-member constituencies may be created, so that the areas may be sufficiently big, to afford facilities for important and eminent people whose presence will be an asset to have easier access to the councils.

“Turning to the question of distributive voting, I should say that we have been enjoying this system ever since elections were introduced in our country; there has been no difficulty felt with regard to it so far. The memorandum argues that if the distributive vote is given and a number of people stand for elections, the electors will not be able to remember the names of the candidates to whom they want to give thier votes. But I think there cannot be any such difficulty that way, because the Government themselves and the Committee too have formed only single-member constituencies in most of the cases. If that is adopted, or even if dual-member constituencies are created, there will be only two seats in a constituency and there will be only four or five candidates standing for election. There cannot therefore be any difficulty for the electors to fix their choice. We have been having in the past local board elections three seats in certain areas, and the electors did not feel any difficulty and were able to exercise their franchise properly. In the City of Madras for the Legislative Council we were having four seats and there was no difficulty whatsoever. Now for the Committee and the Government to entertain a fear that the electors will not be able to exercise their choice well, does not strike me as reasonable and sane excuse. If there are two seats in an area, one general seat and one reserved seat, and if the single vote system is to be adopted, I fear it will not lead to good understanding among the various communities, and I am afraid the vote will go by communities. Thus, the gulf will be much more widened between communities, and there may not be any scope for bringing them together. So, Sir, for these reasons and for the reasons which have been advanced by the previous speakers, I would urge that the distributive system of voting should be adopted; because, as I said, firstly we are accustomed to it and secondly there has been no difficulty so far felt all these years during which it has been in vogue in this province.”

“Then, Sir, with regard to the third part of my amendment, I think the Committee have very well adopted the suggestion of the

3-15
p.m.

[Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder] [1st November 1935]

Government and I have not got much to say on that. My object in giving notice of this amendment is that even in places where they have omitted the grouping to be made, they may take them up. My idea is that it is better if two large towns in a district with decent population were taken into consideration in the matter of grouping, that would make the constituencies somewhat equal and it will to some extent relieve the rural areas of their urban effect. I am glad that it has been carried out to a great extent and I therefore do not want to speak much on it.

“Coming to the fourth part of the amendment, namely, the electorate for the University, I am rather constrained to make a few observations on the great deviation adopted. I am rather surprised at the attitude taken up by the committee on this question. Up to now we have been allowing the University to send a representative to our Council and this privilege has been assigned to the graduates of the University of some years standing. When we have so far allowed this privilege to this class of the electorate who form the intelligentsia of our province, why should we now go to a system which we have not thought of hitherto is the question which I wish to ask. In other provinces, for instance, in Bombay, we find they have adopted the method which they have followed so long. The reason for changing the electorate in our province does not seem to me to be convincing. Even on the Delimitation Committee, the University has not been represented though we have got a University representative in this Council. We know, Sir, that Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar, the hon. Member representing the University, was on the Lothian Committee too and I am surprised to find why he was not made a member of this Delimitation Committee. The Committee only thought it fit to put him on the Committee only when the question of representation for the University was considered; and at least he had the opportunity to add a note of dissent to the first report when it was decided that the Senate should form the constituency for the University seat. In his minute of dissent, he has pointed out that the Senate is not the only body of the University and that there are other bodies like the Syndicate and the Academic Council. I think, Sir, that it was on this that the Committee at a later stage thought it necessary to allow the University as a whole to elect a member. On reading his minute of dissent, we can find, Sir, that it was not the point that he emphasized, but that he stated that it was not the Senate alone that constitutes the University. Even by allowing all the bodies that constitute the University to send a representative, I think the Committee was not justified in putting forth such a recommendation. They say, the graduates of the University may have a chance of exercising their franchise in rural areas. If the rural areas are taken into consideration with about 40,000 or 50,000 voters, there will be only a few graduates in each area and their votes will not influence the result in the least and the result will be that their view point cannot have sufficient representation in the Councils. Such being the case, it is not right that their rights should be taken

1st November 1935] [Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder]

away like this. I think, therefore, the Central Committee will go into the question carefully and give due consideration to this aspect of the matter. Though our representative for the University was given the chance to attend the first meeting of the Committee, I am sorry to hear, Sir, that he was not invited to the second meeting. I am really surprised at this attitude of the Committee. It would have been in the fitness of things that when once he had been invited to consider this question in the first instance, he should have been called to attend the meeting when further opinions and recommendations were received; and it would have been at least some consolation if some consideration had been given to his view-points on the recommendations received. That was not done. This point of enfranchising the graduates for the University constituency has been very elaborately dealt with by my hon. Friend, Mr. Nambiyar, and I need not go into the question more in detail.

“Then, Sir, with regard to the steps that should be taken in conducting elections, though I think it is not a matter which comes under the terms of reference to the Delimitation Committee, I should say a few words by way of suggestions so that they might be taken into consideration when dealing with the question of the conduct of elections.”

The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—“On a point of order, Mr. President, is the hon. Member in order in talking about matters which are not within the purview of the Committee?”

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—“I thought he was going to make certain suggestions. If I am right in thinking so, he can continue. I do not think that he is precluded from making any further suggestions on the report before the House. Am I to understand that Members are precluded from giving suggestions?”

The Hon. Mr. G. T. H. BRACKEN:—“The point I wished to raise was about the methods of election. That was not exactly within the purview of the Committee—polling stations and so on. The Committee have not considered that point at all.”

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—“The hon. Member may drop that point; it is better.”

Item 5 of the amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

* Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—“Sir, I think the Central Committee, as it comes from a far off place not being influenced by this or that consideration, will give due weight to the points at issue and arrive at proper decisions so that there may be no complaint whatsoever on the final proposals set out by this Central Committee. With these few words I beg to move my amendment.”

* Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—“Mr. President, Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the amendments moved by my hon. Friend,

[Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt] [1st November 1935]

and in doing so, I should just like to point out how the principles enunciated in his amendment would apply to the West Coast which is peculiarly situated. It comprises only of two districts, each district with a language and a culture of its own and each by itself forms an infinitesimal minority in this Presidency. Of late the Government have been classifying the two districts on a territorial basis as a West Coast area. Even then we are in a minority; but even there what is sought to be done by the Delimitation Committee is as will be seen from their report, to reduce the little strength which it is entitled to have in this Council on a population basis, a basis which they have adopted for the rest of the province. I do not mean to say that we should go according to population basis in allotting seats or that population basis is the correct procedure to follow in this respect. All that I want to say is, when you are having the basis of population in respect of the other parts of the Presidency, why should you deny that principle to the West Coast alone. It really works a hardship in this way. It is felt as a hardship in the case of Muhammadans in the West Coast. On the population basis, West Coast is entitled to have 12 Muhammadan seats, but this principle is sought to be given up so far as the West Coast is concerned and the result is only 8 seats are given—7 seats for Malabar and one for South Kanara. My submission, therefore, is that on account of giving up the basis of population, West Coast is deprived of four seats which it would otherwise have got. Instead of giving a weightage to a minority area with a culture of its own and needs of its own, they have reduced the number of seats. The needs of the West Coast are as important as the needs of any other part of the province, but on account of its being cut off by the western ghats there is not much of sympathy or love lost between the two portions of the province, so much so, in the matter of education; for instance, if you take medical education in the Madras Medical College, out of 100 seats, 40 are reserved for the Tamil area, about 50 for the Telugu area and only 10 for the whole of the West Coast. The same is the case with irrigation, bridges, medical relief, etc. My submission is that due consideration is not paid to the needs of the West Coast so far as these are concerned.”

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ I would like the hon. Member to cite only relevant analogies.”

* Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—“ I, therefore, submit that if the needs of the West Coast are to be effectively voiced in the Council, even if weightage is not given, at least a proportionate share which the West Coast is entitled to on the population basis—that is, on the basis on which computation of seats is calculated for the rest of the province—should be given. Thus, the principle adopted in this case has worked adversely to the interests of the West Coast. No proposal is made to enhance the general seats. A large if not a major portion of the population are Muhammadans and the general seats are few. So long as you do not raise the number of general seats, the seats of

1st November 1935] [Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt]

the Muhammadans on a population basis should not be reduced as otherwise it would unduly reduce and impair the effectiveness of the West Coast.

"Then, again, Sir, so far as South Kanara is concerned, it was entitled to two Muhammadan seats, but now only one is given. This is really a hardship to the Muhammadans of South Kanara. What the Delimitation Committee thought probably was that South Kanara, like Malabar, consists of Mappillas. That is not so. There is a large proportion of regular Mussalmans, i.e., non-Mappillas in addition to the Mappilla population in South Kanara. If only one seat is given, the regular Mussalmans who are in a majority will come in and will give no room for the minority section to get into the Legislative Council; thus it will work a hardship in the case of these people. Besides, as said above, it would impair the effectiveness of the district representation.

"So far as the woman seat is concerned, I would strongly urge for a woman seat for South Kanara. Every one knows that South Kanara is the first district from which a lady candidate, Mrs. Kamaladevi, contested in a general constituency but unfortunately she failed. That was the first instance of a lady in the whole of India who contested for a seat in this Legislative Council. (A voice: 'She did not succeed.') That is unfortunately so, but the fact remains that South Kanara is a place where ladies are well educated and ladies are cultured and our district comes next probably to Madras in the matter of female education and in the advancement of women (Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar: 'Hear, hear.'). That being the case, for both the above reasons alone, a seat has to be given for women in South Kanara. On the question of representation of dock and factory labourers, injustice has been done by the non-representation of Kasaragod, Udipi, Mulki and Coondapoor, which are all ports and contain many factories, while smaller and more insignificant places in Malabar have been included.

"Coming to the question of representation given to urban areas, my submission is this. Unfortunately, the Delimitation Committee seem to have thought that there are innumerable municipalities in the province, and they seem to have confounded that all municipalities are urban areas, but in fact it is not so.

"All municipalities are not urban areas but all urban areas are municipalities. That is the distinction. As I said all towns and municipalities are not urban in character. It all depends on the type of men resident and the type of civilization prevailing therein, their contact with the outside world by steamer communications and by other means, the existence of factories and the like, the existence of colleges and the trade connexion it has with other districts or areas, etc. The representation is for the urban type of civilization as opposed to the rural type of civilization in any town for which special representation is needed. If they had this view before them, they could have

[Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt] [1st November 1935]

selected better towns and with greater justice. They did not seem to have taken consideration of such things but proceeded to group all municipalities together. Seen in this light, Mangalore has got a very large number of factories and a variety of them also, tile factories, textile factories, cashewnut factories and three colleges and a number of high schools and is the principal port of shipping. The agricultural and raw produce of Mysore finds an outlet at Mangalore Port. Besides being the chief market place, it is a very ancient town. Its civilization is distinctly urban as distinguished from rural, it is really an urban area. It is a port and has steamer communications. I naturally expected that it would have been given a separate representation. That has not been done. We thought that at least Mangalore and Calicut would have been clubbed together. But that proposal of the first report has been given up by the second report. I do not know the reason why. It has caused injustice to the people of these two municipalities.

“On the question of the University seat, I need not enter into details as other speakers have spoken on it. All along the graduates were represented in this House as in other provinces and no reasons have been given for disenfranchising them. Has that been found to be unsatisfactory? I think that that representation ought not to have been given up because I am sure by such a step, this House will be losing the benefit of the really best intelligence of this Presidency. With these words, Sir, I second the motion.”

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—“I take it that item 7 (5) is dropped. Items 6 and 7 with sub-section (5) omitted, have been moved and seconded. Item 9 standing in Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar's name is included in section 4 of amendment No. 7 (Mr. Nachiyappa Gounder's amendment). I would therefore advise him to take up item 10 and move it. He is at liberty to speak on the other amendment he has given notice of.”

* Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“Mr. President, Sir, I have given notice of two amendments, one regarding the University constituency and the other regarding the general electorate. As regards the University constituency, an amendment has already been moved and I therefore propose to advert to it very briefly. As regards the general question, my idea is that instead of single-member constituencies, there should be multi-member constituencies and I therefore formally move the amendment standing in my name:

‘Add at the end the following:—

“and on such consideration this Council is of opinion that the territorial unit for elections to the Legislative Assembly by the general, Muhammadan and Indian Christian constituencies shall, wherever possible, be a whole district and that for returning members to the general seats, each district shall consequently be a plural-member constituency”.’

1st November 1935] [Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar]

Before I go into the amendment, I wish to mention one fact which may have some bearing on the discussions regarding the Report of the Delimitation Committee. It has been claimed that the Delimitation Committee has gone into the question very carefully and sent up its report. I certainly agree with the Hon. the Finance Member that great care has been bestowed by the Delimitation Committee. But there seem to be more minutes of dissent than agreement on the issues. There are a number of dissenting minutes attached to the first report. It cannot be claimed that this report is a unanimous report of people of various shades of opinion who have come together and have given their direction for the carving out of constituencies.

" I shall be failing in my duty if I do not at this stage refer to the good work rendered by Mr. Boag. His memorandum is a very valuable document. I wish only that better results had been obtained. The arguments both for and against plausible positions have been fully and elaborately given and the advantages and disadvantages have been explained. But these arguments, I am afraid, have not been correctly appreciated by the Committee.

" When we go into the question of delimitation we have to consider how it will fit in with the general scheme adumbrated by the Government of India Act. It has been stated by statesmen that the New Reforms are a great experiment and as such require to be very carefully handled. That is why they have these safeguards and the communal electorates. Of course, when a new constitution is to be introduced, it is but necessary that the minorities should feel safe under it. On the question how we shall help the minorities to feel that their position is safe under the Reforms there has been great difference of opinion and I personally feel that the best in that direction has not been done. Various reasons have been given and perhaps the Government is not entirely at fault. Whatever it may be, we see that the need for the protection of the minorities has made it necessary for the electorate being arranged in three grades. We have first the general electorate, then the special electorate for the Muhammadans, and again an intermediate electorate, as it were, between the general and special electorates with regard to the scheduled classes. The Premier's Award gave them a number of seats and this has been modified by the Poona Pact, which, until it is modified will hold the field. When we consider the need for protection for minorities, we have to realize that this is for achieving an ultimate end and all friends of India will agree that we should work for an ideal condition when there will be no need for special electorates and the minorities will feel that their position is absolutely safe even without special protection. In the case of the Muhammadan electorate there was an attempt on the part of political leaders to obviate the need for special electorates even now, by reserving seats for them in the general constituencies. That did not come off, and the result is that we have special electorates for them. The question is: are we to continue under the present system or is it our idea that we should have a future

[Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar] [1st November 1935]

when all communities will be able to shed the unnecessary encumbrances of the constitution and function as they do in the countries of the West like England? If you want to have a general electorate in the future for all communities though not now, how are you going to work towards it? My suggestion is that we should have multi-member constituencies with the district as the electoral unit. The Hindus may have their seats apportioned among the districts, the Muhammadans get about 29 seats and as the number is more than that of the districts, the Muhammadans can conveniently have each district as a single-member constituency. The Indian Christians have about 8 seats and they can select eight districts where they predominate. Similarly also with regard to Adi-Dravidas the same principle can be applied and as they will be getting more seats than there are districts they can have a district as a unit. That will mean that we shall be able to come together and poll together and the candidates standing in any district will be fully conversant with the local conditions and will know each other. If a change is to take place in the future to adopt the system of a general electorate for all communities the change will be easy. It cannot be so under the present arrangements under which the district is dismembered and taluk *A* is grouped with taluk *B* in one case and in another case taluks *B* and *C* are grouped together. How are we going to achieve the object we have in view? As I said this system will only perpetuate the communal divisions that exist at present, the discontinuance of which we hold so dear. There is the other question of the other minorities for whom no special provision has been made. I do not know how, when they are distributed in different taluks in the same district, they can manage to send even one or two of their candidates. These sub-communities have their own special case for representation; and they can have a representative of their own in a multi-member constituency with a district as the unit. Such communities should not be entirely left in the cold. I therefore think, Sir, that the district should be the unit of election so that the sub-communities may come together and take a sympathetic view of the rights and privileges of one another and this will conduce to the achievement of the goal we have in view.

3-45
p.m.

“ If we are going to have a small taluk or a small portion of the district as the unit, the community that predominates in that area will see that its candidate alone gets the seat and the other minorities will not be able to put up a candidate. But the objection, Sir, to the system of multiple constituencies has been stated to be that it is not quite practical and that if you have a big electorate the candidate will not be in touch with the electorate. I think, Sir, this theory of the candidate being in touch with the electorate is a bogey. Of course a candidate should know the views of the electorate and should on occasions be able to get a mandate. But how does he get into touch with the three lakhs of voters who are his electors in an area which is now the unit? Is he going to get into touch with them now? I think, Sir, the theory of getting into touch is exaggerated

1st November 1935] [Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar]

too much. On the other hand, as I said, if you are going to have a district as the electoral unit people of calibre and who are well known in the district will be able to offer themselves for election. But now people with local influence will stand and they will have a better chance than those who are able to do good to the public and who will not take a narrow and parochial view of things. Again a large electoral area will help in reducing corruption to a minimum. It will not be possible to corrupt a whole district. Small promises of doing small personal things will weigh with a small electorate. A candidate who says that he will deal with the general problems of the country and is prepared to help the rural population will be able to appeal to the electorate of a district more than a man with merely local influence. The needs of the rural population have now got to be attended to. As regards the safeguarding of the rights of the rural population, I do not think there is very much difference between one rural area and another and the problems that come before the Legislative Council are all mostly provincial in character. For example, improvements to water-supply and roads, question of better facilities for the agriculturists, question of remission of tax and similar questions are subjects that apply to one area as much as to another. Better facilities with regard to provision of hospitals and dispensaries are similarly common questions. I do not think one rural area differs very much from another. But these are the vital questions that affect the country. If you want to return candidates who will be able to appreciate these problems from a general point of view and will not take a narrow view, why lay too much stress on the need for every member being in personal touch with a small constituency. The Government will hereafter have to deal with policies rather than with the details of administration. It was only yesterday we saw an example of this. The right of appeal to Government provided in the Irrigation Cess Act was taken away as the Government thought it would be enough if the Board of Revenue attended to it. The executive is expected to take charge of the details of administration and the future Government will deal with policies. If that is so where is the need to exaggerate the importance of local conditions and make the candidate to be in touch with the electorate. What is the reason that has been given by the Delimitation Committee for constituting single-member constituencies. It is that it works well in the Western countries, especially, in England. But the whole theory behind the Government of India Act is that conditions in India are not similar. Otherwise where was the need for having separate electorates; and why safeguards? If you admit that the conditions in India are different from the conditions in England why insist on the establishment of single-member constituencies. People talk of ideals. But I feel, Sir, that no ideal is worth while which is not in accordance with our common life. Even in England the last word has not been said on the question of the electorate. The question of electoral reform has engaged the attention of politicians and every now and then we see changes made in the constitution. There are now people who are great supporters of the

[Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar] [1st November 1935]

theory of proportional representation and who are keen on introducing it in the English constitution. We need not feel surprised, Sir, if at a future date multiple constituencies with proportional representation are set up in England. If there had been multi-member constituencies perhaps a person like Mr. Asquith may not have been defeated. Does it not indicate that the present system in England has got its own defects? But the English people being practical and their constitution being flexible they are able to adjust it from time to time. We are in a hide-bound constitution and if we are going to restrict ourselves by adopting the English rules it will be difficult for us to change them when we want. We have now got the central administration here, the Government of Madras. Below it we find the various districts. For the administration of civil and criminal justice and revenue purposes the district is the unit. Below the district though there may be taluks they do not form the divisions of the district for all purposes. With regard to Local Self-Government what is happening? Below the Local Self-Government Department of the Government of Madras there is the district board. With the abolition of the taluk boards the case for the taluks has ceased. The district board is the only board we recognize for purposes of local administration. If you are anxious that in the coming Reforms people should be able to take interest we should have districts as units and the district boards being able to wield influence it will be helpful to the several parties in the elections.

“As regards the University constituency I need not reiterate the opinions that have been already expressed. It is enough for me to say that this recommendation of the Delimitation Committee is a retrograde step. When the idea is to enfranchise more and more people, why this penalty on University education? Why should educated people alone be disenfranchised? You are putting literacy as the qualification in the general electorate. But when it comes to the University the graduate who has been enjoying the right for about 15 or 16 years is to be disenfranchised. This is perhaps the only case of disenfranchisement which has been proposed. I therefore feel it is unfair to the graduates of this presidency and there is no point in making the change. Other presidencies have not made the change. Other presidencies have suggested that the graduates should continue in the electorate for this area. If at all they have made a change it is to reduce the standing that is required of the graduates. If it was seven years, it has been reduced to five or three. Otherwise there has been no change. The change is to get more members. It is said that with regard to the University seat the Delimitation Committee considered that the Senate being the administrative body should send its representative. When you consider the general electorate do you ask an administrative body to send its representative? Do the district boards send their representatives here? There is direct election of the people living in the district, whereas in the case of the Senate it is said that because it is an administrative body it should send its representative. As pointed out by Mr. Nachiyappa Gounder this Committee at first

1st November 1935] [Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar]

thought the Senate alone should send the representative. Then when it was pointed out that the Senate was not the only administrative body constituting the University, the Committee as it were adopted the dictionary meaning and said that University means the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the Senate and the Academic Council and said that those bodies shall be the electorate. That seems to be the reason why this change has been made. Does it not again mean that you are substituting indirect election for direct election? While you are trying to dispense with indirect voting in other places you are adopting it in another form in the University constituency. For these reasons and for the reasons pointed out by the other hon. Members I feel it my duty that I should oppose this retrograde step with regard to the University constituency."

* Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—"Mr. President, Sir, I have great pleasure 4 p.m. in seconding the amendment so ably proposed by Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar. As so much has been said on the subject of the amendment I shall confine myself to one part of it on which I have to move an amendment myself. As I am not sure that amendment will be reached in time, I shall try to say all I have to say on this amendment. The question as to whether the Indian Christian community should have its representatives selected by means of a special electorate or a joint electorate has been a question on which the community has been sharply divided for years. At last a special electorate was sanctioned for the community. Later on it was found that the number of seats given to the Indian Christians was very small; there was a great deal of discontent thereupon; then came the Communal Award which gave as it were a certain amount of weightage to the community. Whereas the Communal Award said that special electorates should be given to the Indian Christian community, they also allowed the privilege of selection being restricted to certain districts, all the other districts being merged in the general electorate. This solution met with the wishes of both sections of the Indian Christian community. Here seemed to lie the solution of the difficulties with which the community was faced. We felt that a special electorate by itself had its disadvantages in that it would drive us into water-tight compartments and prevent us from having the necessary contact with other sections of the people. Those who are wedded to special electorates now found that this afforded a solution. We had special seats and we also were given the benefit of contact with other sections of the people in the district in which the special electorate was not in vogue, and all over the Presidency there was a feeling of satisfaction. Both felt that in this solution there was safety for this community. In the communiqué of 1933, the Madras Government stated that the better arrangement even in the Madras Presidency would appear to be to give seats to certain districts only and to merge the Christians in the other districts in the general electorate. This statement was made without any ambiguity, with the result that there was not much agitation in the Province. Resolutions were passed in certain associations, such as the

[Mr. M. S. Sreshta]

[1st November 1935]

South Kanara Catholic Association recommending that accordingly certain districts be selected, the other districts being merged in the general constituency. If any doubt there was, it was cleared by the Memorandum written by my hon. Friend, Mr. Boag. That memorandum has been already characterized as a very able memorandum, and I very gladly endorse that statement. I think it is the common opinion that it is a very judicial document in which both sides have been clearly set forth, and in which whenever a decision had to be arrived at, Mr. Boag was not afraid to make his recommendation. This is what he says: He states what districts might be selected, if districts are to be selected. He adds:—‘ It may be here mentioned that in paragraph 5 in Appendix III to the White Paper it was assumed “ that practical difficulties will prevent the formation of Indian Christian constituencies covering the whole area of the province, and accordingly special Indian Christian constituencies will have to be formed in selected areas in the province. Indian Christian voters in those areas will not vote in a general constituency. Indian Christian voters outside these areas will vote in a general constituency ”.’ That shows a judicial temper. It is obvious from this that even in the Madras Presidency, it was thought that this suggestion made in the Communal Award should be adopted.

“ I shall now read the communiqué. The word ‘ perhaps ’ has been used in the Communal Award, but I think in the Madras Government’s communiqué, it is definitely stated that working difficulties would be found even in the Madras Presidency. The opinion of the Madras Government was that the better arrangement appears to be to assign eight seats to selected areas, and that this arrangement would prevent the constituency becoming unwieldy. They make the recommendation on the ground that if you selected the areas they would be less unwieldy—in a way I am glad that Mr. Boag does not remember it; because if he remembered that communiqué the report of the Delimitation Committee might have been different, but now I have brought to the notice of the House that there was such a communiqué, I hope that it would be realized that our desire that the constituency should be restricted to seven districts would be complied with. The whole object aimed at was to have constituencies which are easily manageable. The idea was to establish as close a contact as possible between the member and the voter. And that is not possible if a large area is allotted to any member. It has to be noted that in this province, no member is given an area more than a district. The Indian Christian member is given sometimes about three or four districts for his constituency. It is extremely difficult to manage such a big area as this. If there is any doubt on this matter, Sir, you will notice that different sections of the people in this province have come to our help. I thought it was useless to move any resolution in this Council. I was quite prepared to come here, sit and listen to the able speeches made by other members. When I came to the Council and saw that Mrs. Rukmani Lakshmipathi had put in an amendment, which was practically in the same terms as my resolution, viz., that eight seats be assigned to eight districts and the

1st November 1935] [Mr. M. S. Sreshta]

remainder be merged in the general electorate, I was very glad. I was also glad to find that my Friend Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar had a similar resolution, and he has told you already that he is of the opinion that the Indian Christian seats should be assigned to certain districts only and that the rest should be merged in the general electorate. If any section of the community had any objection to our getting both the eight seats and also the minor privilege of voting in the other district, it would be the non-Christian community, the Hindu community. It may be said we are asking too much, having some seats for ourselves and also trying to butt in, as may be said, into the general constituency. But the people have no objection, the Hindu community have no objection whatever, because they would like us to come into touch with them. Here we find representatives of the Congress and of other sections willingly welcoming us. That being so, I do not see why we should be afraid on any score. It is only our internal differences that come in the way. What is the cause of the internal differences it is difficult to say, but that is my honest opinion, it is the opinion of some of the people wedded to special electorates, that the effect of selecting some districts would be to disenfranchise the Indian Christian community in districts which are included in the general constituency. Surely we should have more confidence in our Hindu friends. I do not see how a Christian in a district who has for his member a Hindu is less enfranchised than a person in the Christian electorate. I myself have no such diffidence in my Hindu friends.

“Again, from the national point of view, it is a very good principle for the different communities to get together. It is not impossible to have a joint electorate. I myself still feel that a special electorate is causing hardship. The reasons I shall explain presently. A general electorate will enable us to mix together freely; and that is important from the educative point of view. I feel it is very necessary, Sir, to say so because of the argument of some of my Christian friends that we shall get disenfranchised if we are merged in the general electorate. Practically most of our interests are common. Out of 100 interests, 90 per cent are common. There are certain special interests; for these it is certainly necessary that we should have persons who are experts on points affecting the Christian community to discuss those questions in the Council. This is because we Members of the Council are not only representatives but are also advocates, and our strength in the Council is not due only to voting strength. Our strength is dependent on our advocacy, on the manner in which we advocate our cause and the manner in which we give support to other communities. For this purpose it is necessary that we should have some people who are very well versed in questions connected with our community, questions, such as education in our own schools, and so on. But apart from these things our interests are common interests. Therefore it strikes me that this solution which has been now offered is a very satisfactory solution. It meets the wishes of the people who are in favour of the special electorate and also of those who are for joint electorate. The present Indian

[Mr. M. S. Sreshta] [1st November 1935]

Christian community of Madras is a very influential and highly educated community and it has been always for joint electorates. You will remember that the late Diwan Bahadur Arogyaswami Mudaliyar was in favour of joint electorate. That is the feeling of a large number of people here. They all met at a meeting here recently and spoke in favour of this arrangement, that is to say, eight seats for separate districts and the rest to be merged in the general electorate. And the people who thus met and came to this resolution are not at all ordinary men: they are men of importance, highly educated men. And the memorandum drawn up by them has been signed by the retired Vice-Chancellor of the Annamalai University, an outstanding member of the Indian Christian community, four ex-Members of the Legislative Council and a large number of other important people; and this representation has been sent, I believe, to Government, a copy of which I have got here. Various other representations have reached the Government. I do not know whether they reached the Delimitation Committee. I was myself a member of the Indian Christian Sub-Committee of the Madras Delimitation Committee. We were four on it. I voted in favour of eight districts and the merger of the other districts in the general electorate. Two members voted for the division of the presidency into eight areas and the Chairman remained neutral. This is therefore hardly a definite pronouncement by the Indian Christian community. There were two votes against one. The proceedings of this sub-committee were solemnly placed before the Provincial Delimitation Committee and the latter body, after considerable discussion, decided not to accept the Madras Government's communiqué. They pointed out that this would not be in keeping with a certain section of the Government of India Act which says that only unsuitable areas should be excluded. They say that it cannot be said that the areas which ought to be included in the general constituencies are unsuitable areas. But what is the meaning of the word 'unsuitable'? We have to consider the object aimed at, to find out whether anything is unsuitable to achieve that object or not. In a memorandum which I subsequently presented to the Government I pointed out that it cannot be said that the proposed merger was unsuitable within the meaning of the Government of India Act and also quoted a decision from the English courts *Macbeth and Company v. Chislett* to the effect that the phrase must be defined having regard to the object aimed at. But the decision of the sub-committee in whose hands the welfare of the Indian Christians of the whole province was placed, was not what the Committee should have arrived at. The matter again went up to the Provincial Committee and there is nothing strange in the fact that the same body, sitting in appeal, did not reverse its first decision. As a reason for adhering to their original decision they say:

'The arguments put forward, viz., the political value of familiarizing at least some of the Christian community with the practice of voting in a joint electorate with Hindus, the extensive areas of some of the constituencies and the consequent impossibility of contact between the candidate and many of his

1st November 1935] [Mr. M. S. Sreshta]

electors, are arguments rather against the formation of separate constituencies than against the suitability of any particular district for inclusion in a constituency. The Committee therefore adheres to its original recommendation that the whole Presidency may be divided into eight constituencies for the election of representatives of Indian Christians.'

I may honestly say that after reading this several times I was unable to fathom its meaning. I do not know whether anybody else can. It is said that the arguments are in favour of joint electorate. If that is so, that is an argument for putting the excluded districts in the joint electorate. I am afraid, Sir, this conclusion does not seem to be logical or sound. I therefore appeal to the House to state clearly that the opinion arrived at by the Delimitation Committee on this matter cannot be accepted. I trust that the Madras Government which still has an opportunity of saying what its opinion is, will consider all the arguments which have been adduced in the various memoranda presented after the report of the Committee reached them. There would have been no necessity for this discussion to-day but for the fact that the Madras Government felt that they should have the opinion of the Members on this matter so that if necessary they may revise the conclusions arrived at by the Delimitation Committee. We have still the Central Delimitation Committee to appeal to and I trust that the Madras Government will avail itself of this opportunity of going through the whole matter again and come to a proper decision. I trust that evidence will also be allowed to be taken so that the case may not be lost by default.

"Sir, I should not like to stand in the way of others who have a great deal to say, and if I have wearied the House, I beg its pardon. I only felt that as this may be my swan song in regard to this matter, I should not let go this opportunity without giving expression to what I feel very strongly. I hope that the Madras Government which has now got to consider this question again will go into the matter very carefully, will look into the communiqué of 1933 which perhaps was not available to them before and come to proper conclusions."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"Sir, I find that we will not be able to finish this business at the end of the day. There are three or four amendments yet on the order paper and it will not therefore be possible to conclude the debate to-day. I should like to ask you therefore whether it would not be possible to extend this debate to some time to-morrow as there are other amendments yet to be moved and so many hon. Members anxious to speak."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I have also noticed a good deal of anxiety on the part of several Members of this House to speak on this subject and as many as twenty hon. Members who wish to speak are on my list. Apart from this, there are some amendments yet to be moved. In view of this I consulted other party leaders and they have expressed their desire that we should have some time to-morrow also kept apart for discussing this subject. I think in due deference to the wishes of hon. Members we may have to do that."

[1st November 1935]

V.—ANNOUNCEMENT *RE* NON-OFFICIAL ITEM OF BUSINESS
NEXT DAY.

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I may also inform the House that under rule 6 of the Madras Legislative Council Rules the Local Government authorizes the transaction of the following non-official business to-morrow, namely, the motion of Mr. Patnaik that his Bill to amend the Madras Estates Land Act be referred to a Select Committee. This item will be put as the first item of business on the agenda for to-morrow immediately after questions and answers, and the business left over from to-day's agenda will be taken up afterwards."

IV.—MOTION *RE* SECOND REPORT OF THE MADRAS DELIMITATION
COMMITTEE—*cont.*

* Mr. R. M. PALAT:—"Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move the amendment standing in my name, i.e.—

'Add at the end the following:—

"And on such consideration, this Council is of opinion that Malabar has not been given sufficient seats in the new legislatures."

"I agree with what Mr. Koti Reddi said, that sufficient attention has not been paid either by the Delimitation Committee or by the Government to certain principles which should have weighed with them in allotting the seats to the different districts or to the different racial groups. I hope, Sir, that the Central Delimitation Committee would be willing to accept at least some of the suggestions that I am now going to make.

"Sir, I would say that certain minority areas which have special economic or other interests at variance with those of the rest of the presidency should be given weightage. Malabar and the West Coast come under that. We know that with regard to pepper and coconut-growing, for instance, our interests are entirely different and are not represented at all in this Council. We saw that there was a good deal of agitation in the country and in this Council about putting a duty on the import of rice; but we heard nothing about any similar agitation about coconut except from the West Coast Members and even that was only half-heartedly supported in this Council.

"Again, linguistic groups who feel themselves badly treated should have special consideration. In this I have in mind the case where no irrigation grant has been given to the West Coast districts. We made a representation to His Excellency on this matter and Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar specifically drew attention to the passages in the speech of the then Revenue Member in this Council admitting that there were irrigation works on the West Coast which needed attention and should be considered at a later time. But we see that when actually irrigation grants are granted nothing is given to the West Coast.

"Again, Sir, I would say that if there is a feeling of separateness among a certain section of the people, they should be given sufficient

1st November 1935]

[Mr. R. M. Palat]

opportunity to assert themselves. We know we have heard often in this Council that Malayalis are getting more appointments or that Malayalis are an entirely different people. If the people of the East Coast feel like that, there is every reason that we should be given more representation in this Council to allow us to hold our own and to represent our views. We are scattered and few and that is one reason why we are treated badly.

“ Again as regards communal representation I should suggest that the communal seats which have been given should not be allowed to be taken into account when the district representation figures are calculated. For instance, the Communal Award is entirely different from the district award. We had the depressed or scheduled classes representation arrived at under the Poona Pact. As at present decided there are seven general Hindu seats and one scheduled castes seat. If the scheduled castes are to have one more seat, it would be objected that Malabar gets nine seats. It is not so. If one more seat is given to the scheduled castes it is only the scheduled castes that will get that additional seat. The presidency average of 263,431 caste Hindus per seat should not be allowed to be reduced because one more scheduled caste seat is claimed for Malabar.

“ Similarly with regard to women. As women come under special electorates they should not be included in the district quota. For instance, we know that the Nattukottai Nagarathars' seat is practically commended by a certain class of people in one district, namely, the district of Ramnad. We do not take that into account when we fix the Ramnad district quota. According to the latest evidence tendered before the Central Delimitation Committee women's constituencies are separate. Their seats should not therefore be taken into account when the district quotas are calculated.

“ With these preliminary remarks, I proceed to deal with further facts. I have to point out to you a case of clear injustice which has been done to Malabar Muhammadans by the Committee. While the East Coast Muhammadans were heard by the Committee, although the Muhammadans of the West Coast offered to come at their own expense and give evidence the Committee did not accede to their request. In this connexion I may say Mr. Abdur Rahiman from the West Coast offered to come at his own expense and give evidence but the Committee did not grant his request, but by hearing only the evidence let in on behalf of the Muhammadans of the East Coast the Committee decided *ex parte* against the West Coast Muhammadans. Without taking the women's seat into account, Mr. Boag allotted nine seats to Malabar and of these one seat was allotted to Calicut alone. According to the first report of the Committee they allotted the same number of seats but the Calicut seat was allotted to all the West Coast Municipalities. Government again allotted nine seats to Malabar but the Calicut seat was allotted to Calicut and Palghat. Here again you will notice that so far as the representation of the West Coast is concerned the more members of the majority communities of the Legislative Council there are on the

4-30
P.m.

[Mr. R. M. Palat] [1st November 1935]

determining body the less fair is the treatment accorded to the West Coast. Again in the Committee's second report they take this seat entirely away, so that only eight seats are offered to Malabar. The total population of Malabar including the depressed classes is 2,304,593 or one seat is given for a population of 288,076, while the Presidency average is 267,694 for a total Hindu population of 39,083,349. This is by taking into account only the men's seats of 146 and not the women's seats so that, you will see that Malabar is getting below its due share. The average for the Presidency taking into account women and urban seats is 257,127. According to the Second Report, Malabar does not get any urban seat and on this basis giving Malabar eight seats, the average works out as 271,060 per seat and this again is without taking the women's seat into account. On the same basis, according to the First Report, Appendix III, page 13, West Godavari gets one seat for a population of 213,867, Kistna one for 236,444, Anantapur one for 229,086, although they all form part of the majority community of Telugus and Madras figures are all well below 200,000 per seat, while Nilgiris with a population of 109,865 gets one seat. So, even if we are given ten seats, there would be other districts with greater representation. Going into the question as to why the Mappilla seats were reduced if Muhammadans were not rulers in Malabar, it obviously follows that the Hindus were the Rulers. So the argument which the Committee assigned for reducing the Malabar Muslim representation applies to increasing the Hindu representation.

“Then Palghat and Cochin with a population of 735,649 get only two seats. They certainly ought to get three seats. How is it possible for a person to work this huge constituency? It is practically larger than many of the existing constituencies. Government may stand on the principle of forming these constituencies according to Revenue divisions. Even under Government instructions it is only as a general rule they have issued those instructions but I think such instructions may also be waived in special cases. I submit that is a special case for giving three seats.

“Again, Palghat has a population of 405,777, and Ponnani a population of 324,479, there is no reason at all to combine them. The very small Cochin division with a population of 5,393 can be tacked on to Ponnani and Ponnani with Cochin can be given two seats, one scheduled class seat, as Ponnani contains the largest scheduled population and Palghat one general seat. Similarly Malappuram division with a population of 470,864 can be given two general seats. Calicut and Kurumbranad now one electoral area may be split into two areas instead of two seats for the division. Once it is admitted that there should be an urban seat for Calicut town, no weight should be attached to the fear that Calicut town will dominate the Calicut taluk if the latter is separated from Kurumbranad. Calicut taluk has a population of 234,338 and Kurumbranad a population of 300,976. If this is not acceptable the urban seat recommended by Government, Mr. Boag and the first report may be restored, and given to Calicut

1st November 1935]

[Mr. R. M. Palat]

alone. This fear of the towns dominating the taluk areas will apply equally to the Kottayam electoral area which has Tellicherry town in it or Chirakkal which has Cannanore.

"Then, again, the depressed class population of Malabar on a population basis deserve 1.5 seats. They are now getting only one seat. We have seen that in the general allotment of seats for the depressed classes throughout India that Bengal does not get as many depressed class seats in proportion to its depressed class population as Madras does. Obviously the idea of the Government of India was that the Madras depressed classes are worse off than the Bengal depressed classes. Similarly it is well known that the depressed classes in Malabar are very depressed indeed. Therefore I would suggest that one more seat should be given to them in the Chirakkal taluk and this seat again should not come from the general Hindu seats. It must come from the depressed class quota. The number of general Hindu seats allotted to the district should not be reduced because another seat is given to the depressed classes. These districts are purely artificial areas and a district quota should not be allowed to be affected by the communal quota which is entirely a different thing.

"Then, Sir, with regard to Muslims, the second report says that the Muhamadans on the East Coast command politically more influence than the West Coast Muslims. I would emphasize that the West Coast Muslims—the Moplahs—are far more politically important than the East Coast Muhamadans. We are not concerned with what existed a hundred years ago at the time of the British occupation, but with the present and the future only. Therefore I submit that it is the present political importance of any community which should be taken into account and not what the community was a hundred years ago. Even if that be the criterion, I would point out that it is wrong to say that Moplahs never ruled anywhere in Malabar. I may bring to the notice of the House that the Sultan of Cannanore belongs to a Moplah family and he ruled over that part of the country on the West Coast for quite a long time. The Moplah community is perhaps the oldest Muslim community in the whole of India. As the descendants of the ancient Arab settlers in India and as they are in a compact body they are better custodians of Islamic culture and traditions and they are far more fitted to represent Islam than Muslims who are scattered all over the East Coast among the general Hindu population. In what way do the East Coast Muhamadans differ from the East Coast Hindus? They cultivate the same crops and lead the same mode of life as the East Coast Hindus, or at any rate certain Hindu castes. It is only when a question affecting religion comes in, that there could be any difference between a Hindu and Muslim there. So the only reason why the Muslims should be given special representation is to protect their religion and culture and for this purpose, the Muslims on the West Coast, the Moplahs, who are far more religious than those on the East Coast and are far better representatives of Islam than the

[Mr. R. M. Palat] [1st November 1935]

East Coast Muslims should have adequate number of seats. I imagine that people who are living as a compact body are better fitted to represent their real opinion and interest than those who live scattered among other communities. We see that Government in the case of Indian Christians have divided the whole Presidency into eight constituencies and my hon. Friend Mr. Sreshta, has argued that the eight seats assigned to them should not be scattered over the whole Presidency but that those constituencies should be formed in selected areas, where Christians are most numerous and the eight seats allotted only to them. I also join with him and say that that should be the only criterion on which we should proceed and not that we should be going on giving representation to district after district, without reference to population even if there is only one Muslim living in a district, and thus prevent them from expressing their real opinion.

"In this connection I should like to read part of a letter which I received from a Mappilla friend of mine. If the House desires that I should give his name I am prepared to give it. This is what he says in his letter:—

'Secondly you may tell them (meaning the East Coast Muhammadans) that they are unfit to represent the cause of Islam as many of them you will find are toddy vendors in the Eastern districts. Not a single Mappilla has anything to do with the selling of toddy. We Mappillas are better fitted to represent the cause of Islam than the East Coast Muhammadans.'

"That is the letter written to me by a Mappilla politician from Malabar.

"Again, Sir, is it true that the extreme South was really under Muslim rule when the British came? I understand from the Imperial Gazetteer, Volume XVI, page 251, which says that Cuddalore was given to the British by the Mahrattas. Tanjore had a Mahratta dynasty for a long time and they were ruling there for a long time. A great many wars went on between the Poligars and the British and Tinnevely was taken from the Poligars although there may have been a shadowing Muslim overlordships. So it is not correct to say that the Muslims in the East Coast or the South are politically more important and therefore we have given them more representation. The real test should be who are now best fitted to have more representation. Viewed from that stand-point, I think that the West Coast should be given more seats.

"Again, Sir, my hon. Friend, Mr. Subrahmanya Bhatt, pointed out certain cases of injustice to the West Coast as to admission to the Colleges. It would not have occurred if there were more Members in this House representing the West Coast. Unfortunately the West Coast Members are so scattered that we are not able to assert ourselves. By demanding more seats, I do not mean to say that the West Coast people should stand in future together, but there will not be this constant attack on the West Coast. I do not want to say anything more as Mr. Pocker will be seconding me, and supplementing what I have said."

1st November 1935]

B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur :—“ I have very great pleasure in second-
ing the amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Palat, and before
I come to the subject proper, I feel it my duty to express my appreci-
ation of the very valuable services rendered by Mr. Boag in preparing
the memoranda that he has prepared and placing it before the Delimi-
tation Committee. So far as I can see it is so thorough that there is noth-
ing more to be desired in it. There is one other remark which I would
like to make before I proceed to the subject proper and that is this.

“ Sir, I have not given notice of any amendment to the subject 4-45
under discussion for the reason more or less indicated by the Hon. the P.m.
Finance Member, when he opened the debate. He said that while
there were certain general questions on which any amendment in this
House might be of use, amendments on the question of the number of
seats to be allotted to a particular district would be of no use. That was
the reason why I did not give notice of any amendment. I thank you,
Mr. President, for giving me this opportunity to speak on this occasion
by being allowed to second the amendment moved by Mr. Palat. But
for this opportunity, I would not have been able to have my say on
this matter, because there are many other Members who have given
notice of amendments proper and they should all be exhausted before I
could be allowed to speak. I have referred to this matter at length
because, the fact that I have not given notice of any amendment press-
ing our claims in its proper form, should not be construed to mean
that we have no claims to represent.

“ Sir, my constituency claims that the Government have not recog-
nized the principle of representation on the population basis. The
Delimitation Committee accepted that principle in their first report.
There was absolutely no reason for the Government to deviate from it
later on. My constituencies claim that they should have the full repre-
sentation of thirteen seats, because on the population basis we are enti-
tled to twelve seats, and the woman's seat also, because we have the
largest number of women voters. No doubt, the woman's seat has been
allotted to Malabar only provisionally in Mr. Boag's memorandum.
He has expressed a doubt whether Muslim women will be available in
Malabar to stand as candidates for the Legislative Assembly. It was
only on the recommendation of the Women's Sub-Committee that the
woman's seat was shifted from Malabar to Madras. I do maintain that
on that ground the woman's seat should not have been shifted from
Malabar. There are enough qualified Muslim women candidates in
Malabar and if the Government wants their names, I am prepared to
give them.

“ The other proposals of the Government were virtually fully
adopted by the Delimitation Committee in their first report with some
changes as to the areas of the constituency within Malabar itself.
Subject to these changes, the entire recommendations of the memo-
randum were fully accepted by the Government.

[B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur] [1st November 1935]

“ At this stage I should like to refer to one aspect of the question. In considering the Muslim question, the Government rightly thought that there should be a communal sub-committee. In the Main Committee there was only Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib, who knew practically nothing of Malabar except that he paid a flying visit to it for the first time in his life during the last vacation. But for that he is absolutely ignorant of the conditions of Malabar. Therefore he cannot represent and he does not represent Malabar. That was why the Government thought that there should be a Muslim Sub-Committee. The Muslim Sub-Committee was properly constituted. There was one member for the Malayalam area, one for South Kanara, two for the Tamil area and two for the Telugu area. This Sub-Committee considered all the aspects of the question of Muslim representation and they threshed out the whole matter and came to certain conclusions. They are very valuable conclusions. Neither the Delimitation Committee nor the Government ought to throw away those recommendations lightly. Now, Sir, what are the recommendations of the Muslim Sub-Committee? They virtually accepted the proposals in the Government memorandum even including the allotting of the woman's seat to Malabar. The Chairman alone said that the question of the woman's seat should be decided after consulting the Women's Sub-Committee. Unfortunately, in the Women's Sub-Committee there was nobody representing Malabar women. So, that Women's Sub-Committee which was in ignorance of the conditions in Malabar assumed that Malabar being a rebellious area or an area about which they knew nothing, could not have suitable women candidates for the legislature. It was on that assumption that that Committee recommended the shifting of the woman's seat to Madras City. Therefore, I do say that we are entitled to the woman's seat also. In the Muslim Sub-Committee there were Messrs. Yakub Hasan, Yahya Ali Sahib and Khalifulla Sahib. Of course Khan Bahadur Khalifulla Sahib was not able to be present at the meetings of the Committee, but the Tamil area was well represented by Mr. Yakub Hasan. The Muslim Sub-Committee was unanimous in their recommendations except for the dissenting minute of Mr. Yakub Hasan to the effect that one seat should be taken away from South Kanara and given to certain cities in North Arcot, with which dissenting minute Mr. Yahya Ali Sahib also agreed. The Sub-Committee virtually adopted the well-thought-out recommendation of the Government. The matter went to the Main Committee and the members of the Sub-Committee were allowed to participate in the discussions of the Main Committee. They put their views before the Main Committee and with the assistance of the members of the Sub-Committee, the Main Committee came to certain conclusions. The Main Committee did not change the recommendations of the Sub-Committee except that they shifted the woman's seat to Madras City. At this stage we all thought that the matters had been finally decided. But there are political agitators. They are more concerned with agitation than anything else. They went on

1st November 1935] [B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur]

agitating that the public point of view had not been considered, public criticism ought to be invited and it ought to be considered. All right. Public criticism was invited by the Government and public criticism was offered and further memoranda were presented to the Committee. Now let us see what the Committee did at their second meeting? The members of the Muslim Sub-Committee on whose report the main Committee published their first report and consulting whom they arrived at valuable conclusions in their first report, they were not invited for the second meeting. Is it fair that the conclusions arrived at in consultation with the Sub-Committee which is an expert body on the subject should have been reversed without giving an opportunity to the Sub-Committee to ventilate their views? Who represented the Muslim interests in the second meeting of the Committee? Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib. I have already said that he does not know anything about the conditions in Malabar. In his dissenting minute he has declared himself hostile to the interests of the Mappillas. In view of the attitude taken by him in his dissenting minute, I do say that the Mappillas were absolutely unrepresented at the second meeting of the Main Committee. The Mappillas have been deprived of their legitimate share *ex parte* without being heard. The very sound conclusions arrived at by the Committee in consultation with an expert body of Mussalmans have been thrown overboard without any ceremony and very unfairly. Now let us see what are the reasons which persuaded this Main Committee themselves to change their views. As somebody has put it, they constituted themselves into an appellate body over their own decisions. Even then, for a review of their own decisions, there must have been patent errors on the face of it. In this connexion I should like to refer to their own words. In paragraph 7 on page 6 they say:—

‘Further the weightage has been given on account of the political influence of the Muslim community, and in Madras that influence has lain more in the Northern Circars, in the Ceded Districts, and in the Carnatic than in Malabar and South Kanara.’

What did the Committee really mean by political importance? If it means that the Britishers took this or that part of the Province from Muslim rulers, I say that the Britishers took Malabar from Muslim rulers. Tippu Sultan was reigning in Malabar and it was from the hands of Tippu Sultan that the British took Malabar. If that is the meaning of political importance, we have as much political importance if not greater political importance than the other East Coast Muslims. One other possible interpretation of political importance is that the Muslims in certain areas are perhaps the direct descendants of the old Muslim rulers. But it is not a fact. Sir, the Muslim rulers were either the Moghuls or free-booters who came from far-off lands. The Muslims of the Tamil area and the Muslims of the Telugu area are indigenous to the Tamil area and the Telugu area. They are not the descendants of the Moghul Rulers or the free-booters who came here from far-off lands. I say, Sir, this sentence in the report cannot be justified. On

[B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur] [1st November 1935]

the other hand the real political importance of the community is the importance of the community in the whole country, in the Government of the country. In that connexion, I would lay stress on one aspect of the question so far as the Mappillas are concerned. If the future of the Government of the country is to develop as we all desire it should, if the country is to be self-sufficient in all vital matters, if the country is to be able to look after its own affairs especially the affairs of primary importance like the defence of the land, if the land is to be defended by ourselves and not by foreign soldiers who are defending us now, I ask, Sir, on whom are you going to rely for this purpose? Are you going to rely on those people whom we see on the East Coast or are you going to rely on the Mappillas to defend your hearths and homes? Can you imagine any other community in the whole of India who will be ready to sacrifice their lives for a cause which they think to be right? If and when once they think it is their duty to defend their country they will never set any value to their lives. I ask you to consider whether there is any other community on whom you can rely to defend India in the future? It is all very well for my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed to bawl out at the top of his voice, but when he hears the first shot of a gun or sees the army coming five miles off, he will be found at once taking to his heels. Is it Mr. Basheer Ahmed on whom you are going to rely for the defence of the country in the future Government or is it the Mappillas on whom you are going to rely? You have to rely on the Mappillas. It might be that their courage might have been misdirected in the past on occasions, but they have grown wise. They know how to behave properly hereafter."

* The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member may continue his speech to-morrow. The House will now adjourn and meet again at 11 a.m. to-morrow."

The House adjourned.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.